

The Review of English Studies

VOL. VI.—No. 22.

APRIL 1930.

THE "INTIMATIONS" OF WORDSWORTH'S *ODE*

BY HERBERT HARTMAN

LIKE others of his Fenwick Notes (dictated in 1843) Wordsworth's own commentary on his celebrated *Ode* is inaccurate and misleading, if not indeed evasive. The poem, he noted some forty years after its inception, was composed at Town-End, Grasmere, and two years at least intervened between the writing of stanzas I-IV and of the remainder, V-XI. It "partly rests," he continues, on particular feelings or experiences of his own mind: in childhood the notion of death could not invade his "sense of the indomitableness of the Spirit within [him]"; he looked for an Elijah-like translation to Heaven; to his child's nature external things lost all objective identity, and he would timorously recall himself from the "abyss of idealism to the reality." An universal idiosyncrasy of childhood, he treats this in the *Ode* as a "presumptive evidence of a prior state of existence"—but not, he protests (in reply to certain critics), as a belief. It is too shadowy for faith, being only an element in the instinct of immortality. However, he concludes guardedly, there is nothing to contradict it, although revelation is wanting; thus the notion of a pre-existent state is an item of many popular creeds, and an ingredient of Platonism itself. Hence the poem on the "Immortality of the Soul" has sufficient foundation in humanity for its projection by a poet as hierophant.

An addendum to this familiar note has been found in his statement¹ that the poem is not "a literal representation of the state of

¹ To his nephew Christopher Wordsworth (*Memoirs*, ii, 476).

the affections and of the moral being in childhood," but rather his own feelings, his absolute spirituality, his "all-soulness" at the time—when he could not believe that the body would moulder into the dust of the grave.

These explanations and disclaimers the world (of Wordsworthians, at least) has long considered as the poet's honest but caviling gloss on his great *Ode*. But they continue to invite inquiry, and to suggest, in view of modern research, an entire re-consideration of the poem. Who, for example, led Wordsworth—whose confessed medium was (in 1798) "language really used by men"—into such metaphysical speculation? By whose agency did he attempt here for the first time the Cowleyan form of stanza? And who actually came trailing clouds of glory before him as he wrote, serving as an incarnate model for this universal idea? Recent studies¹ have found the answers to all these questions in the persons of S. T. C. and his infant son "li'le Hartley" Coleridge.

I

Coleridge's connection with Wordsworth's *Ode* is quite clearly established, but the story requires re-telling with necessary amplifications.

On Friday, March 19, 1802,² Coleridge—after some four months of London and Davy's lectures "to increase his stock of metaphors"—took his not untrodden way from Keswick to Dove Cottage, Grasmere. The Wordsworths found him "half-stupefied" with ill-health and dejection; his shaping spirit of Imagination was, he himself confessed, woefully failing.³ But before he retired for the night he disputed with Wordsworth about Ben Jonson,⁴ whom the poet and his sister had been reading. The following snowy day, Dorothy records, "William and Coleridge walked. . . . We had a little talk about going abroad. After tea William read *The Pedlar*. Talked about various things—christening the children, etc."⁵ The

¹ E.g. Garrod, *Wordsworth* (1927 ed.), ch. viii; also John D. Rea, *Mod. Phil.*, XXVI, No. 2 (November 1928), 201-213.

² Not March 18, as given by Rea.

³ Cf. his "long, verse-cramm'd letter" to Sotheby, July 19, enclosing the "Dejection" *Ode* (written April 4), *Letters*, i, 376-384.

⁴ Dorothy's *Journals* (1925 ed.), 103. On February 11, Jonson's short poems "were too interesting for him [*i.e.* William], and would not let him go to sleep." Further notes of their reading in Jonson are on February 14, March 10, March 23.

⁵ *Ibid.* (March 20), 103. Coleridge left on Sunday, March 21.

children in question were, of course, Hartley and Derwent Coleridge.¹ Now S. T. C. had long held mixed metaphysical views on the baptismal ceremony, finally overcoming his Godwinian contempt for the "sprinkling" sacrament (by 1832 he had come to consider the service as "almost perfect"). To understand, however, the views occasioning this discussion with Wordsworth, we must return in time to the arrival of Coleridge's first-born, six years before.

Hartley's birth, in September 1796, provoked three sonnets from the logician, metaphysician, father. "Annihilated" by the suddenness of the news, S. T. C. (then in Birmingham with Charles Lloyd) retired to his room to address his Maker.² He then wrote the sonnet

When they did greet me father, sudden awe
Weigh'd down my spirit, . . .³

giving vent to his confused thoughts and shapeless feelings, praying that the overshadowing Spirit descend on his babe and he be born again "a child of God." Journeying homeward (with Lloyd) to see his new-born infant, he composed a second sonnet, of which the first draft reads:

Oft of some unknown Past such Fancies roll
Swift o'er my brain as makes the Present seem
For a brief moment like a most strange dream
When not unconscious that she dreamt, the soul
Questions herself in sleep! and some have said
We lived ere yet this fleshly robe we wore.
O my sweet baby! when I reach my door,
If heavy looks should tell me thou art dead,
(As sometimes, through excess of hope, I fear)
I think that I should struggle to believe
Thou wert a spirit, to this nether sphere
Sentenc'd for some more venial crime to grieve;
Did'st scream, then spring to meet Heaven's quick reprieve,
While we wept idly o'er thy little bier!⁴

Here certainly is an early intimation of immortality—from recollections of early parenthood; and the source of Coleridge's

¹ Hartley, b. September 19, 1796. Derwent, September 14, 1800. (Berkeley, b. May 14, 1798, d. the following March.) Hartley, Derwent and Sara (b. December 23, 1802) were finally baptised, at Southey's request, November 2, 1803. For baptismal register record, see Rawnsley, *English Lakes*, i, 59. For S. T. C.'s attitude towards baptism, see *Anima Poetae*, 33, 81, and Hazlitt's anecdote of the same prejudice in his "Poets" essay. For Coleridge's later view, see *Table Talk*, August 9, 1832.

² *Letters*, i, 25.

³ *Poems* (Oxford ed.), i, 152-153.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 153-154. On Wordsworth's "derivation" of the notion through S. T. C., see Harper, 449-450; also Garrod, 115.

musings on pre-existence is not far to seek. In his letter to Poole (enclosing the sonnets) S. T. C. explained :

Almost all the followers of Fénelon believe that men are degraded Intelligences who had all once existed together in a paradisiacal or perhaps heavenly state. The first four lines express a feeling which I have often had—the present has appeared like a vivid dream or exact similitude of some past circumstances.”¹

Coleridge's conviction then, *vis à vis* Fénelon, is the doctrine of *anamnesis*, or Reminiscence, the belief that Heaven lies about our infancy—which is a period to be spent, in turn, on this nether sphere as in a prison-house to which the spirit is sentenced.

The third sonnet (addressed to Lloyd), which followed soon after,

Charles ! my slow heart was only sad, when first
I scann'd that face of feeble infancy,²

drops from the level of neo-Platonism to that of personal reflection. Coleridge confesses, on seeing the child, a parent's remorse ; soon, however, he was “thrill'd and melted”—and “all beguill'd of dark remembrance and presageful fear.” For the time being there are no further “intimations.” But ten days after Hartley's birth, S. T. C. (a confessed “library cormorant” now “*deep* in all out-of-the-way books”) asked Thelwell to get him Item 4676 in the bookseller White's catalogue : “Iamblichus, Proclus, Porphyrius, etc., one shilling and sixpence, one little volume.”³ This volume, a

¹ MS. letter cited by E. H. Coleridge, ed. *Poems*, i, 154, n. 1. Fénelon (1651-1715), Archbishop of Cambrai and author of *Télémaque*, has variously been called a sentimentalist, a mystical saint, an eighteenth-century *philosophe*, an ultramontane churchman, an hysterical hypocrite, and a borrower from contemporary *précieuses*. His Christian neo-Platonism is apparent in the following passage : “Platon enseignoit aussi la métempsychose, qu'il avoit prise de Pythagore, et ensuite tournée à sa manière, comme on peut le voir dans ses dialogues intitulés *Phèdre*, *Phædon*, *Timée* et autres. Quoique Platon ait fait un fort beau dialogue sur l'immortalité de l'ame, cependant il est tombé sur cette matière dans de grandes erreurs, soit par rapport à la substance de l'ame, qu'il croyoit composée de deux parties, l'une spirituelle et l'autre corporelle ; soit par rapport à son origine, prétendant que les ames étoient préexistantes aux corps, et que, tirées du ciel pour animer successivement différents corps, elles retournoient au ciel après avoir été purifiées ; d'où, au bout d'un certain nombre d'années, elles étoient encore employées à animer successivement différents corps ; de sorte que ce n'étoit qu'un cercle continuel de souillures et de purifications, de retours au ciel et de retours sur la terre dans les corps qu'elles animoient. . . .” (“Vies des Anciens Philosophes” (Plato), *Œuvres*, ed. Aimé-Martin (1835), iii, 306).

² *Poems*, i, 154.

³ November 19, 1796 (*Letters*, i, 182). He ordered also the works of Julian, Sidonius Apollinaris, and Plotinus. The Iamblichus and Julian were still, E. H. Coleridge noted in 1895, in the family's possession.

compendium of excerpts, furnishes a new link, Rea notes,¹ in the marriage of two true minds which was, six years later, to beget the celebrated *Ode*.

Meanwhile other intimations came to the awed metaphysico-theologico-parent. Hartley's birth caused emendations of an earlier "effusion," the lines *To An Infant* written in 1795; they were slightly altered to apply to "yon sweet Child," concerning whom he addresses the "thrice holy Faith":

O thou that rearest with celestial aim
The future Seraph in my mortal frame. . . .
Still let me stretch my arms and cling to thee,
Meek nurse of souls through their long Infancy!²

It is obviously an image, an anthropomorphic idea to be met with later in Wordsworth's *Ode*.

Coleridge's son again invades his verses in the well-known lines of *Frost at Midnight* (published 1798), but the poem is personal and prophetic rather than neo-Platonic. Then the next year brought an event which was to stir S. T. C. to the depths of his metaphysical soul—the death in March of his ten-months-old second child, Berkeley. From Germany he wrote painfully to Poole: "This bodily frame is an imitative thing, and touched by the imagination gives the hour which is past as faithfully as a repeating watch. But Death—the death of an infant—of one's own infant. . . . My baby has not lived in vain. . . . Consciousness!—it is no otherwise necessary to our conceptions of future continuance than as connecting the present link of our living with the one immediately preceding it; and that degree of consciousness, that small portion of *memory*, it would not only be arrogant, but in the highest degree absurd, to deny even to a much younger infant. 'Tis a strange assertion that the essence of identity lies in *recollective* consciousness. . . . Oh, this strange, strange, strange scene-shifter Death!—that giddies one with insecurity and so unsubstantiates the living things that one has grasped and handled! . . ."³

And two days later he wrote consolingly to his wife: "I will not believe that it [*i.e.* life] ceases—in this moving, stirring, and harmonious universe—I cannot believe it! . . . To look back on the

¹ *Op. cit.*, 206 ff. The volume was edited by Ficino in 1578. For title, see *ibid.*, 208. Cf. also Lowes, *Road to Xanadu*, 229, 230, 233.

² *Poems*, i, 91-92, and note. For S. T. C.'s study of infancy in his own child Hartley, see *Anima Poeta*, 2-3: "The first smile—what kind of *reason* it displays," etc.

³ April 6, 1799 (*Letters*, i, 282-284).

life of my own baby, how short it seems ! but consider it referently to non-existence, and what a manifold and majestic *Thing* does it not become ! What a multitude of admirable actions, what a multitude of *habits* of actions it learnt even before it saw the light ! and who shall count or conceive the infinity of its thoughts and feelings, its hopes, and fears, and joys, and pains, and desires, and presentiments, from the moment of its birth to the moment when the glass, through which we saw him darkly, was broken—and he became suddenly invisible to us ? . . . I confess that the more I think, the more I am discontented with the doctrines of Priestley. He builds the whole and sole hope of future existence on the words and miracles of infants—only because according to his own system of materialism he has not discovered how they can be made *conscious*. But Jesus has declared that *all* who are in the grave shall arise—and that those who should arise to perceptible progression must be ever as the infant which He held in His arms and blessed.”¹

Now doctrines of this sort—of pre-existence in a paradisiacal state, of metempsychosis, of degraded Intelligences sentenced to earthly expiation, of ultimate Seraph-hood, of infant memory and “recollected consciousness,” of guarantees of immortality—these rarely sprang full-armed from the brain of S. T. C. Eclectic metaphysician that he was, the scent of neo-Platonism clings to most of his gospels, much as borrowings from exotic travel literature invade his poetry.² Here again, then, as we have his own acknowledgment of debt to Fénelon, we appear to find another source in Proclus.³

It has been suggested that the volume of “Iamblichus, Proclus, Porphyrius, etc.” sent by Thelwell at Coleridge’s request in 1796, at length found its way to Dove Cottage in June 1802 ; and several entries in Dorothy’s *Journals* support the assumption. On Thursday,

¹ *Ibid.*, 284–287. The letter concludes with his verse “On an Infant, who Died before its Christening”—

Be rather than be call’d a Child of God !

² Lowes’ *Road to Xanadu* is, of course, a triumphant piece of *Quellenforschung* in this latter connection.

³ Cf. Rea, 207–209, who cites Dorothy’s *Journals* : June 10, “Coleridge came in with a sack full of books.” June 13 (the day after S. T. C. left), “William observed that the full moon, above a dark fir grove, is a fine image of the descent of a superior being” (Trailing clouds of glory do we come”). June 17, “William added a little to the Ode he is writing.” And Proclus has this telling passage: “Descensus animæ in corpus seiunxit quidem illam a divinis animis, a quibus intelligentia, et potestate, puritateque implebatur. Coniunxit vero generationi, et nature, materialibusque rebus a quibus oblivione, et errore, et ignorantia est imbuta”—which has the full implication of

Our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting, etc.

THE "INTIMATIONS" OF WORDSWORTH'S ODE 135

May 6, she records: "When we came in we found a magazine, and review, and a letter from Coleridge, verses to Hartley, and Sara H." The verses mentioned may have been the "Answer to a Child's Questions" on bird-songs,¹ but far more likely they were the well-known lines:

A little child, a limber elf,
Singing, dancing to itself—

which form the "Conclusion to Part II" of *Christabel*²—of which the MS. version was sent in a letter of Southey of May 6, 1801,³ exactly a year before. This brings the infant Hartley, now almost six years old, again on to the scene. Six days later, May 12, S. T. C. walked over, and the "three persons and one soul" talked until one o'clock in the morning (Dorothy and her "dear dear Coleridge" continuing until a quarter-past two). The next day, Thursday, found Coleridge departing. On Friday, "William very nervous. After he was in bed, haunted with altering *The Rainbow*." On Saturday came a melancholy letter from Coleridge. And on Tuesday Dorothy left for his home at Keswick; the following day she and S. T. C. met Wordsworth near the six-mile (*i.e.* halfway) stone; and that evening they parted, to be joined again by Coleridge on Saturday—when they had "some interesting melancholy talk about his private affairs" (probably the impending breach with Mrs. Coleridge). Then on Monday Coleridge left for home. But the next few days were sleepless ones for Wordsworth; and he tired himself out with "hammering at a passage."⁴

Obviously it was a season of poetic fertility for these Lake Poets. The almost daily interchange of visits, interfusion of spirit, and interplay of ideas between them (Dorothy was the prose poet of the triune group) was manifestly in operation, as it had been a few years before in the *Lyrical Ballads*. Coleridge's next appearance in person was on Thursday, June 10, when—after having been attacked by a cow—he brought in the above-mentioned sack full

¹ *Poems*, i, 386.

² *Ibid.*, 235-236. First printed 1826.

³ *Letters*, i, 355-356. The lines follow the remarks: "Dear Hartley! we are at times alarmed by the state of his health, but at present he is well. If I were to lose him, I am afraid it would exceedingly deaden my affection for any other children I may have." In conclusion, he calls the lines "A very metaphysical account of fathers calling their children rogues, rascals, and little varlets, etc." In any case the lines sent to Wordsworth were not, as Rea suggests, the sonnet(s) on Hartley's birth almost six years before. For by 1802 S. T. C. was no longer a poetaster; the *Lyrical Ballads* had appeared between!

⁴ Dorothy's *Journals* have a lacuna from May 25 to May 28.

of books; and he remained for two days. Exactly a week after his arrival, on Thursday, June 17, Wordsworth added a little to the *Ode*. He had begun it March 27, the day after finishing *The Rainbow*¹ (which was later to be prefixed as a motto).

One other item of indebtedness is to be inferred from Dorothy's *Journals* over the period. Tuesday, March 23, found Wordsworth reading Ben Jonson. Only a few days later, a "divine day" in Dorothy's record (as it proved to be for literature), he began—at breakfast—his first attempt in the irregular Pindaric ode, the famous "Intimations" stanzas. Had he, in this metrical experiment, found a model not for emulation so much as for a point of departure, in Ben Jonson? Shortly before, we know, he had argued about Jonson with S. T. C.

II

Ben Jonson was, of course, the first to attempt an elaborate Pindaric choral ode in English, imitating not merely Pindar's rhythmical intricacies, but also, in his Morison lament, following the structural device of recurring strophe, antistrophe and epode. Like Congreve's and Akenside's,² Jonson's odes (certain ones, that is) are strictly regular. Wordsworth's first essay in the field, on the other hand, is licentious and pseudo-Pindaric; for (as Hazlitt tells us) "the Ode and Epode, the Strophe and Antistrophe, he laughs to scorn." But on Friday and Saturday, March 19-20, Coleridge and Wordsworth had "disputed about Ben Jonson," walked and talked about "various things—christening the children, etc." On Tuesday, Wordsworth read Jonson again; and on Saturday, March 27, the immortal *Ode* was begun.³ Dorothy records the incubation of no other poems (and few escape the notice of her all-seeing eye) until April 16. But on Sunday, April 4, "I walked down to Coleridge's. Mrs. Calvert came to Greta Bank to tea. William walked down with Mrs. Calvert, and repeated his verses to them." This, Rea notes, is the same date exactly as S. T. C.'s own "Dejection" *Ode*.⁴

In all this, the interchange of visits, discussion of christening

¹ *Ibid.*, 104.

² Cf. Edmund Gosse, *English Odes* (1881).

³ Cf. Rea, 204: "(It is worth noting that Wordsworth, by his process of recollecting in tranquillity, often let just about a week pass between the first impulse to a poem and the time of putting it into verse)."

⁴ See letter to Sotheby, July 19 (*Letters*, i, 378-383), in which he quotes ll. 1-16, 21-72, 94-125 in the earliest form. Cf. *Poems*, i, 362.

THE "INTIMATIONS" OF WORDSWORTH'S ODE 137

Coleridge's children, neo-Platonic arguments (and possible loan of S. T. C.'s copy of Proclus), discussion about Ben Jonson, and striking identity of date in the "Dejection" and "Intimations" odes—more than coincidence may be traced. For in their intermittent periods of personal contact the Lake Poets seldom worked independently. In the metrical similarity, in the personal interplay—Coleridge's apostrophe of Wordsworth, and the latter's use of little Hartley Coleridge in stanzas VII–VIII—and in the impelling kinship of mood—in all these is manifest witness of the collaboration that links the Lake Poets while keeping each singularly and happily *sui generis*.

It is, of course, straining at a gnat to seek more than a superficial resemblance in the metrical form of Coleridge's "Dejection" stanzas and Wordsworth's "Intimations" Ode. Each, it is true, consisted originally of eight stanzas;¹ and in verse-length they are certainly more nearly alike than either is in accord with Jonson's Morison ode.² And they agree, at variance with Jonson's, in the preponderance of pentameter lines and occasional internal, as well as final, Alexandrines. But S. T. C.'s point of departure is evident in his attempt to keep to strict Pindaric division, until the process breaks down in its very execution;³ for his "Dejection" poem, like the earlier *Ode on the Departing Year*—originally printed with Pindaric terminology—falls away into irregularity. Coleridge himself accounted for this when he said, a few years later,

The odes of Pindar (with few exceptions, and these chiefly in the shorter ones) seem by intention to die away by soft gradations into a languid interest, like most of the landscapes of the great elder painters. Modern ode-writers have commonly preferred a continued rising of interest.⁴

His interest in odes and odists was, of course, one of long standing;⁵

¹ Assuming the conventional break between V–VIII and IX–XI.

² Coleridge's run 20–18 (orig. 27)–8–12–17–18–32–14, Wordsworth's 9–9–17–22–19–8–23–21.

³ Cf. R. M. Alden, *English Verse* (1903), 311.

⁴ *Animus Poetae* (? October 1806), 142. His preoccupation with metrics is well known. At Cambridge he preferred, by reference through Latin to Greek forms, Collins' odes to Gray's, finding "The Bard" defective and inferior in lyric feeling to Cotton's "Ode on Winter" (*Biog. Lit.*, ed. Shawcross, i, 27 n.; *Animus Poetae*, 4; *Table Talk*, October 23, 1833). Cowley's fantastic language charmed him (*Biog. Lit.*, i, 15; ii, 66), while Ben Jonson's "smaller works are full of poetry" (*Table Talk*, June 24, 1827). Wordsworth too, it is worth noting, considered Gray a failure (*Letters*, ii, 80), but had high praise for Collins (*ibid.*, ii, 358).

⁵ He wrote Anacreontics a decade earlier (*Poems*, i, 33), and in 1791 he had composed mock-Pindarics (*ibid.*, i, 21–22). But it was the true lyric ode that he came to admire for its subjectivity, and because "it delights to present things as

and in his preference for the Cowleyan form he was obeying the dictates of his own nature, which was ill equipped for the "soft gradations," "languid interest" and metrical importunities of the strict Pindaric form.¹ S. T. C., however, unlike his fellow-poet, had tried his hand at strophic measures; and his academic reverence for the form left its impress upon his dissenting practice. So if the two poets' argument about Ben Jonson referred to his odes, the inference is plain that Coleridge made a plea for the serviceability of the stricter form. Judged, however, by the immediate results—and it was a familiar Romantic controversy—Wordsworth's answer in emancipation proved to be a glorious instance of the triumph of poetry over prosody.

Only one conclusion, then, may be drawn from the facts at hand: if their argument about Ben Jonson pertained to his odes, their respective stands on the matter bore fruit in the poems that followed. For one week later (March 27, 1802) Wordsworth "kindled" and began his "Intimations" *Ode*, as licentious in form as it proves grandiloquent in effect; and by April 4, S. T. C. enclosed in a letter to Sotheby most of the stanzas of his "Dejection" poem, a "conversation ode" not entirely disencumbered of the strophic properties of the true Pindaric.² Any further assumptions of metrical kinship are unsafe and impertinent;³ it is on other scores that the companion odes have substantial points of contact.

His own poem, Coleridge confessed, was written "during that dejection, to Wordsworth, and the greater part of a private nature, I thus expressed the thought in language more forcible than harmonious."⁴ Indeed, when the poem appeared for publication⁵ actually existing and visible, although associated with the past, or coloured highly by the subject of the ode itself" (*Table Talk*, October 23, 1833).

¹ Cf. Garrod, *Coleridge*, 184: "The debt of Coleridge to Cowley is much greater than is commonly realised," etc.

² E.g. the rhyme-scheme of I and II begins *abbacc*, like strophe and antistrophe; then disparity sets in.

³ Rea, *op. cit.*, 203, quotes part of the Morison Ode, suggesting that Wordsworth's is "in cadence and phrasing reminiscent of this of Jonson, on the glory and radiance of youthful innocence."

⁴ *Letters*, i, 378. "That dejection" is explained above: "I wished [in translating the 'Erste Schiffer'] to force myself out of metaphysical trains of thought, which, when I wished to write a poem, beat up game of far other kind. Instead of a covey of poetic partridges with whirring wings of music, or wild ducks *shaping* their rapid flight in forms always regular (a still better image of verse), up came a metaphysical bustard, urging its slow, heavy, laborious, earth-skimming flight over dreary and level wastes," etc.

⁵ First published, *Morning Post*, October 4, 1802, six months later. Cf. Canon Ainger's article in *Macmillan's Mag.*, lvi (1887), 81-87. Also Coleridge's *Poetical Works*, ed. Campbell, 626-628.

all evidence of the private nature was removed. Thus the apostrophe "Yes, dearest poet, yes!" is deleted; and "O dearest Poet," "O Wordsworth!" and "William" become in turn "O Lady!" or "Lady." Moreover, the following lines are omitted:

This, William, well thou knowst,
Is that sore evil which I dread the most,
And oft'nest suffer. In this heartless mood,
To other thoughts by yonder throstle woo'd,
That pipes within the larch-tree, not unseen,
The larch, that pushes out in tassels green
Its bundled leaflets, woo'd to mild delights,
By all the tender sounds and gentle sights
Of this sweet primrose-month, and vainly woo'd!¹

Nor does the revealing apostrophe of the following passage appear in the printed version:

Calm, steadfast spirit, guided from above,
O Wordsworth! friend of my devoutest choice,
Great son of genius! full of light and love,
Thus, thus dost thou rejoice.

To thee do all things live, from pole to pole,
Their life the eddying of thy living Soul!
Brother and friend of my devoutest choice,
Thus mayst thou ever, ever more rejoice!²

Obviously, then, the entire "Dejection" Ode was originally an intimate lyric epistle to Wordsworth. Coleridge penned it with his "shaping Spirit of Imagination" at low ebb; the condition was evident to his friends on his return in the middle of March, and it became increasingly alarming to all three, as Dorothy's *Journals* reveal in the weeks that followed. Entries about agitated spirits, discussion of going abroad, William's ill health, walks and talks with or about S. T. C.—these come in rapid succession. Wordsworth, it would seem, troubled with thoughts of Annette—on March 22 Dorothy and he resolved to see her, and then "that Wm. should go to Mary"—was not immune to the contagious mood of his fellow-poet.

In outline Coleridge's stanzas bemoan (I) his inertia, (II) his "stifled, drowsy, unimpassioned grief" and loss of feeling, (III) his

¹ In ii, following the quatrain on "A grief without a pang," etc. Cf. *Poems*, i, 364.

² *Ibid.* 366. Cancelled from the conclusion to V. Not only Dorothy but "Edmund" takes Wordsworth's place at the end of VIII, for S. T. C. had written:

O Edmund, friend of my devoutest choice,
O rais'd from anxious dread and busy care,
By the immenseness of the good and fair
Which thou see'st everywhere (*Ibid.*, 368 n.)

failure of genial spirits, (IV) his unwonted soullessness. He knows (V) his crying need of Joy, which he has lost (VI) along with Fancy, Hope and Imagination. He invokes (VII) the Storm-wind ("Mad Lutanist!") and in its hush hears the cries of a lost child (? Sara); he invokes further the spirit of gentle sleep upon Dorothy, and (in the earlier version) craves the influence of Wordsworth's equanimity and love of "the immenseness of the good and fair." It is evident at once that certain elements of this jeremiad are interrelated with the "Intimations" *Ode*, with its query

Whither is fled the visionary gleam?
Where is it now, the glory and the dream?

There is a verbal correspondence between the "Dejection" line

There was a time when tho' my path was rough

and Wordsworth's very opening

There was a time when meadow, grove, and stream

But the echo is farther to seek; it has a being in S. T. C.'s "Ode in Mrs. Ratcliff's Manner," *The Mad Monk* (1800):

There was a time when earth, and sea, and skies,
The bright green vale, and forest's dark recess,
With all things, lay before mine eyes
In steady loveliness.¹

Finally, as regards the companionship of the odes, when Wordsworth on April 4 "repeated his verses" to Mrs. Calvert and Coleridge, were they not stanzas I-II of the "Intimations" *Ode* begun eight days before? For that very same evening² S. T. C. replied in echo:

Yes, dearest poet, yes!
There was a time when tho' my path was rough,
The joy within me dallied with distress . . .

—concluding with his apostrophe to this "friend of [his] devoutest choice." The identity of date can scarcely be ignored.

III

As Coleridge in his dejection served to induce or foster the mood in which Wordsworth began his great *Ode*, it would appear only fitting that the latter—when, later, he required a visible model for

¹ *Poems*, i, 347-349. Cf. Garrod, *Coleridge*, 182 n.

² "Letter, written Sunday evening, April 4" heads the *Ode* (*Letters*, i, 380).

THE "INTIMATIONS" OF WORDSWORTH'S ODE 141

the indoctrinated lyric—should incorporate a picture of S. T. C.'s firstborn. As Wordsworth's immortal sister informs much of Coleridge's poetry, so little Hartley Coleridge takes his place, on occasion, in the work of the future Laureate.

Wordsworth's stanzas *To H. C., Six Years Old* belong both in substance and form, it has been noted,¹ with the "Intimations" Ode. Little Hartley, the "faery voyager" of the stanzas, was an universal darling of six in the year 1802, which dates the beginning, at least, of the Ode. And in rhyme-scheme the stanzas to him are unmistakably like the irregular Cowleyan measures of the greater work.² Hartley, we shall see on examination, is in both the direct object of the poet's fond concern and natural apprehension.

Substantially the Ode may be outlined as follows: The poet complains (I) that for him the common sights of earth have lost the celestial light, the glory and freshness of dream with which they were once invested; (II) the rainbow and rose, the moon and waters on a starry night, sunshine—all these remain; but a glory has passed away from the earth. In a sylvan setting (III) a thought of grief was dispelled by a timely utterance; henceforth the mountain echoes, the winds, land and sea, the beasts—all keep a May-time holiday; and a shepherd boy, Child of Joy, shouts round him. The poet's heart (IV) is with them in their jubilee; children are culling flowers and earth is preening herself, the sun shines and the Babe leaps from its Mother's arm—these he sees and hears with joy; but a lone tree in a single field again reminds him of something gone, and a pansy repeats the tale; the visionary gleam, the glory and the dream are gone. He moralises (V) that the Soul comes star-like from its home in God, neither innocent nor unmindful; so earth becomes a prison-house for the child—God having a purpose in the commitment—for youth is Nature's priest lured on by the vision splendid, which only man sees fade into the light of common day. Thus Earth (VI), the Mother and homely Nurse, would make her inmate Man forget his former home in God. In witness whereof (VII) behold this child of six at his parents' feet, with his own dream-world, an analogon to the world of fact; but this very child (VIII) is the true Philosopher, his heritage fresher for being a Seer more newly come from Eternity (while adult ways are

¹ Cf. Garrod, *Wordsworth* (ed. 1927), 116; also Mary Joseph Pomeroy, *Poetry of Hartley Coleridge*, 15. Derwent Coleridge's Memoir of Hartley (*Poems*, xl-xli) assumes, but does not urge, the same conclusion.

² Especially in the initial quatrain and general distribution of couplets.

darkened by the grave); why must this child of Immortality assume the burden, forfeiting its blessedness, becoming the prey of earthly cares and onerous custom? Yet surely (IX) something remembers, for childhood delight and liberty give way to questionings and misgivings,¹ high instincts which are shadowy recollections from that first Soul-birth in God—these are eternal truths and ineradicable; thus inland the Soul has sight of that immortal sea on whose shore we are now but dabbling children. Let all then (X) rejoice in May-time gladness, that though rapture in the things of Nature passes, strength abides in what remains, faith that looks through death in maturer years with the philosophic mind. So the poet (XI) feels anew the might of natural objects, hills, groves, brooks, clouds—all take a light from the watching (and hierophantic) eye; hence the meanest flower has its eternal import, inducing “thoughts that do often lie too deep for tears.”

Such—its compelling music silenced by prose—is Wordsworth's gospel in the *Ode*, whose motto on “natural piety” asserted “the Child is Father of the Man.” Shorn of its grandeur, wanting the diapason of immortal verse, how homiletic it all appears! Yet Coleridge himself reminds us, in the *Literary Remains*, “How shall he fully enjoy Wordsworth, who has never meditated on the truths which Wordsworth has wedded to immortal verse?”

We have seen that the dejection of stanzas I–II was companioned by Coleridge's own ode on his impaired Imagination.² But the affianced poems are essentially as different as the fellow-poets.³ For Wordsworth characteristically found relief (III) in a timely utterance,⁴ and a sylvan Maytime scene restored for the moment his

¹ Cf. *Poet. Works*, ed. Knight, iv, 58. Godwin took the opposite view: “Nothing can be more incontrovertible than that we do not bring pre-established ideas into the world with us” (cited by Harper, 182).

² Coleridge's reply seems implicit in the lines:

O Wordsworth! we receive but what we give,
And in our life alone does Nature live. . . .
And from the soul itself must there be sent
A sweet and powerful voice, of its own birth,
Of all sweet sounds the life and element!
O pure of heart! thou need'st not ask of me
What this strong music in the soul may be!

³ “I rather suspect that somewhere or other there is a radical difference in our theoretical opinions respecting poetry.”—S. T. C. to Southey, July 29, 1802 (*Letters*, i, 387).

⁴ Possibly, Garrod (113) suggests, the motto poems, “My heart leaps up,” begun the day before the *Ode*; two months later, May 14, “After he was in bed, haunted with altering *The Rainbow*.” The “timely utterance” may also have been a letter to Annette, written March 26, the same day as the lyric (cf. Dorothy's *Journals*).

bliss—a recovery rarely apparent in the lifetime of the less buoyant S. T. C.

But following the momentary bliss of III,¹ the poet returns, in the conclusion of IV, this time interrogatively, to his opening motif,

Where is it now, the glory and the dream?

It is at this point—from which Wordsworth in 1843 claimed a lapse of some two years in the composition—that the poet, Rea notes, merely feels the loss of youth's visionary gleam and seeks an explanation. As yet there is no statement of doctrine, of pre-existence or of innate ideas. If, then, S. T. C.'s arrival on June 10 with a "sack full of books" spells the introduction of Proclus, the notion of pre-existence in V-VI is accounted for ("thou need'st not ask of me *What this strong music in the soul may be*") and the chronology of those stanzas becomes established. There is certainly further pressing testimony. Coleridge remained for three days; the next day (June 13) Dorothy observed; "The full moon (not quite full) was among a company of steady island clouds, and the sky bluer about it than the natural sky blue. William observed that the full moon, above a dark fir grove, is a fine image of the descent of a superior being." And three days later, "A short letter from Coleridge. William added a little to the *Ode* he is writing." Thus the notion of the soul trailing clouds of glory ("Descensus animæ" in Proclus) seems to date itself at this period—not, as the poet told Miss Fenwick, some four years afterwards. The doctrine appears to have come, *via* Coleridge, from Proclus about June 1802. Indeed, Proclus may plausibly be the "Pagan suckled in a creed outworn" of the famous sonnet written in the same year.²

One thing, however, is demonstrably certain—that the corporeal image introduced in stanzas VII-VIII to illustrate the doctrine advanced in V-VI, is the tiny son of Coleridge. Not only was little Hartley a precocious, dwarfed child of six at the very time,³ "A six

¹ Dorothy's entries are telling clues to the substance of this stanza. May 4, "On the Raise we met a woman with two little girls, one in her arms." May 6, "It is a nice, cool, shady spot. The small birds are singing, lambs bleating. . . . When we came in we found a magazine, and review, and a letter from Coleridge, verses to Hartley, and Sara H." Again on May 22 (with S. T. C.), "We sat a long time under the wall of a sheep-fold. Had some interesting melancholy talk about his private affairs." And the children culling flowers in IV had elsewhere their setting, in "the poem of *Children gathering Flowers*"—April 28. The poem received the name *Foresight*.

² Cf. Rea, 207-211, for this re-dating of V-VIII.

³ Originally "four," the change to "six" was made for the 1807 edition, for purposes of verisimilitude. Hartley was born September 19, 1796. "Little Hartley" the dalesmen always called him because of his remarkably short stature.

years' Darling of a pigmy size," but his "dream of human life" here outlined by Wordsworth was familiar to all his playmates, attendants, and neighbours in the Lake District in his unending narrative of a mythical kingdom, "Ejuxria" or "Jugforcia."¹ "An elaborate map of the country," wrote Derwent in his Memoir, "was once in existence." This map ("some little plan or chart" of the *Ode*) is lost; but two "fragments from his dream of human life" remain: one, in Mrs. Coleridge's handwriting, cited by Derwent; the other, a letter from Sara Coleridge (*i.e.* again the mother) to Miss Barker, in the Harvard Library.² Besides these relics, the little Actor's "humourous stage" is the subject of many fond anecdotes in the memory of his father, brother, uncle Southey, and friends.³ Thus the seven ages of man—and Dorothy records reading in *As You Like It*⁴ on June 22–23 during another of S. T. C.'s visits—were thus passing "in endless imitation" before Wordsworth's very eyes in the tireless chatter of his fellow-poet's six years' Darling.⁵

Re-read in this light the "Intimations" *Ode* takes on new meaning. For the alarming precocity of little Hartley gave the poet—who was not ordinarily interested in children⁶ (rarely mentioning even little "Basil" [*i.e.* Edward] Montagu, the Wordsworths'

¹ Cf. Derwent's Memoir in his edition of Hartley's *Poems* (1851), xxxvi ff. Wordsworth's lines appear in a footnote in support of this "common instinct and trick of childhood."

² Derwent cites "The History of St. Malo, an enthusiastic Reformer and Hierophant." "There were," he recalls, "many nations, continental and insular, each with its separate history, civil, ecclesiastical, and literary, its forms of religion and government, and specific national character." "Portfomandra" was the analogon to England.

The Harvard MS. (Eng. 45*) is "a wild story, the history of an Ejuxrian" written out by Sara as amanuensis, dated Keswick, April 10, 1808. It is the history of St. Malo in a later, elaborated form. The principal gods in his kingdom of Maza include Fanaticon, Ordanicus, Pomonia, etc.

³ De Quincey, for example, discusses Hartley's dream-world as contrasted with his own island of "Gombroon" (*Introduction to the World of Strife*).

⁴ Proclus' chapter "Ætates septem planetis septem congruæ" seems to have been a "source" for Shakespeare in depicting the seven ages of man (cf. *Philological Quarterly*, iv, 4 ff.). Vaughan's "Retreat" has also been referred to the same, while the opening lines of his "Corruption" bear a disturbing resemblance to the *Ode* of our inquiry.

⁵ "Their little boy Hartley," wrote Dorothy in September 1800, "who is an original sprite, is to come and stay with us [*i.e.* at Gramere]. He is a sweet companion, always alive, and of a delightful temper" (*Letters*, i, 126). Only one letter is preserved (Knight ed.) from the year 1802. Mrs. Coleridge and Hartley came for three weeks in July 1800 (*Journals*, 43); while the Wordsworths went to Keswick in December 1801 (*ibid.*, 68), and again in July 1802 (*ibid.*, 141). But the interchange of visits must have exceeded those mentioned.

⁶ Cf. Rawnsley, *Wordsworthiana* (ed. Knight), 86.

THE "INTIMATIONS" OF WORDSWORTH'S ODE 145

charge for years)—a first-hand insight into the mysteries of a child's mind, "whose fancies from afar are brought." Thus the verses *To H. C.* of the same period ¹ (along with S. T. C.'s lines in *Frost at Midnight* and the Conclusion to Part II of *Christabel*) ² must be read in conjunction with the great Ode, to which they are in some sort exegetical. For had the "Child among his new-born blisses" been other than the "exquisitely wild" darling of S. T. C., Wordsworth's intimations of immortality may well have been quite different.³ For as they stand they were not so much recollected from his own childhood as witnessed in the precocity of his despairing fellow-poet's firstborn. Already the years were bringing their inevitable yoke, heavier indeed than frost, to bear on the yielding shoulders of the elder Coleridge; and Wordsworth with his dedicated spirit and consecrated powers was bound to see something of the taint in Hartley at the time. The stanzas in conclusion, IX–XI, a kind of coda to the symphonic *Ode*, were written probably (as Wordsworth claimed) some two years later,⁴ in a Maytime mood. By then Coleridge had somewhat recuperated from the abject melancholia,

Sense of past Youth, and Manhood come in vain,

of 1802; hence the conclusion of the *Ode*, a pæan of optimism so far as the personal interrelationship is concerned, is a return to *allegro*.

¹ "O Thou! whose fancies from afar are brought" is quoted, Garrod notes (116), by S. T. C. in *Anima Poetae* (13) under March 17, 1801, although the poem is usually assigned to the year 1802.

² Along with, as Garrod further suggests, *The Prelude*, xii, 272–286, and the *Ode composed upon an Evening of extraordinary Splendour and Beauty* (1818), ll. 61–80.

³ The sub-title "Intimations of Immortality from Recollections of Early Childhood" appeared (in seeming apology) first in the edition of March 1815, when the motto poem was also first prefixed. In its earliest form the poem was simply an "Ode."

⁴ Rea suggests the plausible period December 1806–February 1807, when S. T. C. and Hartley visited the Wordsworths at their Coleorton farmhouse. At the time Wordsworth was preparing his poems for the 1807 edition (cf. *Poems in Two Volumes*, ed. Darbishire, 1914). At the same time (*Anima Poetae* (1806–1807), 155) S. T. C. noted: "Aristotle's Works, and to hunt for Proclus." Seven years later Lamb (who records having heard Coleridge unfold the mysteries of Iamblichus and Plotinus as the "inspired charity boy" of Christ's Hospital days) wrote his oldest friend: "But I will not forget to look for Proclus. It is a kind of book which when one meets with it one shuts the lid faster than one opened it. Yet I have some bastard kind of recollection that somewhere, some time ago, upon some stall or other, I saw it. It was either that or Plotinus, 205–270 A.D., Neoplatonist, or Saint Augustine's 'City of God.' So little do some folk value, what to others, *sc.* to you, 'well used,' had been the 'Pledge of Immortality'" (August 26, 1814: *Letters*, ed. Lucas, VI, 441. Cited in part by Rea, 213).

Again, to return to the "Six years' Darling," when Wordsworth dictated his Fenwick note (1843) Hartley had become, at forty-seven, the object of pity and charity—a familiar, unkempt, frequently besotted laureate of the dalesmen, living on the Wordsworths' bounty in close proximity at Nab Cottage. The Laureate wrote Moxon late in 1842: "I have done all that can be done for you in Hartley's case. . . . It is, therefore, evident that you must trust nothing to him in future. He cannot be relied on for unperfected work that is to be done in a limited time."¹ In fact, his vagrancy and ale-house irresponsibility had become common district gossip; and he continued to "wander like a breeze," a wistful, gentle-hearted inheritor of unfulfilled renown. Yet to the humble cottagers he was the "cliverest man i' England as some say, and did a deal to help Mr. Wudsworth out with his poetry and all."² It is quite unlikely then that Wordsworth—who was only less well known among the people of Westmoreland and Cumberland—would identify Hartley for posterity as the "best Philosopher" of his *Ode*, who had in his gentle but wastrel manner so illy sustained the unkindly shocks prophesied in the stanzas *To H. C.*

Coleridge's familiar protest (*Biog. Lit.*, ch. xxii) against the "Intimations" *Ode* is certainly a warranted one. "In what sense," he asks, "is a child of that age a *philosopher*?"—and he brings to bear (his old "metaphysical bustard" game) Spinoza, Behmen, Lessing, and others. He further objects to the lines

To whom the grave
Is but a lonely bed without the sense or sight
Of day or the warm light,
A place of thought where we in waiting lie.³

"The analogy between death and sleep is too simple, too natural, to render so horrid a belief possible for children." "The ode," he continues, "was intended for such readers only as had been accustomed to watch the flux and reflux of their inmost nature, to venture

¹ *Letters*, iii, 255-256.

² Rawnsley, *English Lakes*, ii, 139.

³ Cf. Dorothy's *Journals* for April 29, 1802: "We then went to John's Grove. . . . He thought that it would be so sweet thus to lie in the grave, to hear the peaceful sounds of the earth, and just to know that our dear friends were near." Lamb, cataracts and winds find a place in the same entry, whence Rea (209-210) dates the composition of III-IV in the spring of 1802. See also Wordsworth's *Poems*, ed. Hutchinson.

at times into the twilight realms of consciousness, and to feel a deep interest in modes of inmost being, to which they know that the attributes of time and space are inapplicable and alien, but which yet cannot be conveyed save in symbols of time and space. For such readers the sense is sufficiently plain, and they will be as little disposed to charge Mr. Wordsworth with believing the Platonic pre-existence in the ordinary interpretation of the words, as I am to believe, that Plato himself ever meant or taught it."¹ This was the reason, of course, for the poet's disclaimer, in having "given pain to some good and pious persons," that he meant to inculcate such a belief. It is, he apologizes, too shadowy a notion to be recommended to faith. Could it, we may ask in conclusion, have been otherwise—having come from S. T. C.'s lips in 1802, through Proclus (earlier through Fénelon), who in turn looked back through Plato to Pythagoras? In fine, then, without being a necessary item of either's creed the eschatological idea or doctrine embraced (rather innocently, we may conclude) in the *Ode* is just the sort of fond neo-Platonic speculation with which others of the Lake Poets' joint labours are sicklied o'er.

The final effect, then, of the great *Ode* is such that Arnold considered it declamatory, Lord Morley contrary to fact and partly nonsense; while Ruskin called it indisputable, Emerson "the high-water mark which the intellect has reached in this age," and Saintsbury signalised it as one of the greatest poems in English. Certainly the truth lies somewhere midway, for, as his latest biographer reminds us, Wordsworth's *Ode* is "a stumbling-block to prosaic and a temptation to over-speculative minds."² With the doctrine it advances and its source in the dark backward and abysm of philosophy, and with Wordsworth's persistence in or tergiversation from the concept,³ we have little right (and uncertain basis) to be further concerned. It should, however, contribute to an understanding of the motives and *matériel* of the work to see how Coleridge's mood and companion poem of 1802 interacted with Wordsworth's; to take into some account the preceding discussion of Ben Jonson; to

¹ Cf. Wordsworth's comment to Mrs. Clarkson (? 1814) on the two recollections of childhood in the *Ode*, the passing splendour of objects of sense and the indisposition to bend to the law of death (*Letters*, ii, 43).

² Harper, *Wordsworth*, 445. "It is," he concludes, "the supreme example of what I may venture to term the romance of philosophic thought."

³ See the passage from *The Friend* (1809) cited by Harper, 448; also his preceding interpretation of the entire poem. On Wordsworth as a pure sensationist vs. Plato as a pure intellectualist, see Garrod, *Wordsworth*, 117 ff.

trace the influence on Wordsworth's listening ear of Coleridge's neo-Platonic speculations on pre-existence, degraded Intelligences and infant baptism;¹ and to find a model for the "Philosopher" of the *Ode* (it was, incidentally, Lamb's pet name for Hartley) in S. T. C.'s own precocious child. All these are far more deeply interfused in the poem than has hitherto been taken into account. "When I was impelled," Wordsworth dictated, "to write this poem on the Immortality of the Soul, I took hold of the notion of pre-existence as having sufficient foundation in humanity for authorising me to make for my purpose the best use of it I could as a poet." The notion is indeed, he admitted, too shadowy for belief; but his willing suspension of disbelief has served to inspire, if not to constitute, poetic faith in his readers—which no amount of clinical anatomizing can dispel. For under the lens of scholarship the poetry itself, the real vision splendid, can never fade into the light of common day.

Bowdoin College,
Brunswick, Maine, U.S.A.

¹ Wordsworth's immunity to S. T. C.'s eclectic "preaching" (as Lamb stutteringly labelled it) is nowhere better stated than by Coleridge himself: "The *thinking* disease is that in which the feelings, instead of embodying themselves in *acts*, ascend and become materials of general reasoning and intellectual pride. The dreadful consequences of this perversion [may be] instanced in Germany, e.g. in Fichte *versus* Kant, Schelling *versus* Fichte, and in Verbidigno [Wordsworth] *versus* S. T. C." (*Anima Poetae*, 143 (under date of 1805)).

PLAYERS IN THE PARISH OF ST. GILES IN THE FIELDS

BY GERALD EADES BENTLEY

THE parish of St. Giles in the Fields has an interest for the dramatic student, for it was in this parish, some time in 1616, that Christopher Beeston built the Phoenix or Cockpit in Drury Lane.¹ Although the parish church was situated some little distance northwest of the theatre, one expected that many of the players connected with the various companies performing at the Phoenix before the Civil Wars² would be found in its registers. These books have never been printed, and there has never been a thorough search in them for seventeenth-century actors and dramatists, though an occasional name has been sought.

The normal presumption of dramatic information in the vestry papers of parishes in which theatres were located³ is increased in the case of St. Giles in the Fields by stray quotations which John Parton included in his history of the parish in 1822.⁴ In 1623, the parish church having fallen into disrepair, a petition was prepared on the authority of the king and the bishop to raise money for a new building. All the money collected was entered in a vellum book entitled *Liber Domus Dei Anglice, or Doomes-day Booke*,⁵ which contained, in the list of contributors in the parish, "The plaiers of the Cockpitt Plaichouse . . . [*£*]20 --." ⁶

¹ J. Q. Adams, *Shakespearean Playhouses*, 348 ff.

² Notably Queen Anne's men, Lady Elizabeth's, Queen Henrietta's, and the King and Queen's Young Company or Beeston's Boys. See Adams' chapter on the Cockpit, *op. cit.*

³ See my articles on players in *T.L.S.*, November 15, 1928; *Modern Language Notes*, June 1929, and *P.M.L.A.*, September 1929.

⁴ *Some Account of the Hospital and Parish of St. Giles in the Fields, Middlesex*, London, 1822.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 194.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 197.

Parton says that there was also an assessment book.

"It was made and signed by many of the then principal inhabitants, and contains the name of every individual inhabitant, as well householders and inmates, as servants; with sums affixed against their names, as in the opinion of those signing the assessment, they respectively ought to pay towards the new church."¹

An example of the information contained in this book is to be found in the items which Parton records about the Cockpit. The first is, "the *Phœnix* playhouse viij^{li} xiiij^s v^d rece^d by Mr. Spreckart". But this sum was evidently thought too small, for immediately following it is the entry, "Rec *more*, by Dr Mayn from y^e *Cockpitt* x^{li} vij^s", acknowledged later as, "Receaved from Mr. Biston, as from y^e Cockpitt for and toward y^e building of y^e church, y^e sm of tenn pounds & seaven shillings". Together the actors and housekeepers contributed £39 1s. 5d.—an early form of entertainment tax.

Obviously these vestry books, together with the parish registers, promised to add materially to our information about the Cockpit and the actors there. But promises are treacherous. When I made enquiries at the parish church, I found that nothing was known of the Domes-day Booke or the assessment book. Moreover, the volume of parish registers in which I was most interested—christenings and burials from 1610 to 1636—was also missing. Neither the verger nor the rector knew what had become of any of these books, though they must all have disappeared in the century since Parton wrote.

The value of the remaining registers is limited by the fact that they do not give occupations. Therefore, of the names of actors and dramatists I noted, about two-thirds had to be discarded as too common for serious identification. The names mentioned below are sufficiently unusual to make identification probable. Where this is not true, I have tried to show why I thought the entry worth including.

I have examined the registers for the years in which I am chiefly interested, which in this case cover the entire period of the existence of the Cockpit as a pre-Restoration playhouse. I have tried to include all entries which may reasonably be taken as referring to actors or dramatists in the burial registers 1636-1653, in the christening registers 1637-1650, and in the marriage registers 1610-1650.²

¹ *Some Account of the Hospital, etc.*, u.s., 196 n.

² The limited period for christenings and burials is due, of course, to the missing registers.

The entries, of course, are quoted exactly except for the dates, which it has been found convenient to rearrange. I have used the form 1636/37 to indicate the last three months of the year 1636, Old Style, or the first three months of 1637, New Style.

With each set of extracts there is given, in the case of the actors, a brief outline, by no means complete, of what is known of the man. I have tried to confine these references to standard works, but in some cases it has been necessary to refer to unpublished material. For the half-dozen dramatists, I have attempted only to show my reasons for thinking that the playwright might be identified as the man in the St. Giles registers.

WILLIAM ALLEN

- | | |
|--------------|---|
| 1629 29 June | (Married) " William Alleyne and Elizabeth Blane " |
| 1638 30 Sep. | (Christened) " Samuell sonne of William & Alice Allen " |
| 1639 5 Dec. | (Married) " William Allen & Elisabeth Russell " |
| 1640 13 Sep. | (Christened) " Robte sonne of William & Alice Allen " |
| 1642 10 July | (Christened) " Ann Daughter of William and Alice Allen " |
| 1643 4 Apr. | (Buried) " Mary Daughter of William Allen " |
| 1644 28 Apr. | (Christened) " Hester Daughter of William and Alice Allen " |
| 1645 1 Aug. | (Buried) " Hester daughter of William Allen " |
| 1646 12 July | (Christened) " John sonne of William and Alice Allen " |
| 1647 28 Sep. | (Buried) " Michael sonne of William Allen " |
| 1648 20 May | (Buried) " Elisabeth Daughter of William Allen " |
| 1652 7 Oct. | (Buried) " William So : of William Allin " |

Since most of the known facts of Allen's life connect him with the Cockpit, the inclusion of these items is not altogether fatuous. His name is in the cast of each of the five plays which constitute our chief knowledge of the personnel of Queen Henrietta's company, all given at the Cockpit ; in 1630 a warrant for liveries for the Queen's company was directed to him ;¹ and Wright in *Historia Histrionica*² says that he was one of " those of principal note at the Cockpit ". Wright also says that in the wars he was a major and quarter-master general at Oxford,³ but he may have confused the actor with the William Allen who was a drum-major before the wars.⁴

The above items must refer to at least two men. There is a slight hint that the first marriage may be that of the player, since John

¹ Mrs. C. C. Stopes in *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, vol. xlv, 1910, 95.

² Hazlitt, ed. Doddsley, 1874, vol. 15, 406.

³ *Ibid.*, 409.

⁴ *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic*, 1639-40, p. 550.

Blaney appears with Allen in the cast of Massinger's *Renegado* between 1624 when it was licensed ¹ and 1630 when it was printed.²

CHRISTOPHER BEESTON

1638 15 Oct. (Buried) "Christopher Hutchinson alias Beeston"

Christopher Beeston was one of the most important figures of the Jacobean and Caroline stage. He was responsible for the building of the theatre in this parish in 1616,³ and he ruled with a strong hand all the companies that acted here. His long stage career began with the Lord Chamberlain's men, for he appears in the cast of *Every Man in His Humour*, probably performed in 1598. Later he became a leader of Queen Anne's company. He was manager of all the succeeding companies at the Cockpit: Prince Charles's, Lady Elizabeth's, Queen Henrietta's and Beeston's Boys. Court orders which I have found recently seem to indicate that he was interested in a variety of financial undertakings.

This burial entry undoubtedly refers to the player, as his will—extracts from which Mr. Leslie Hotson quotes ⁴—was made October 4, 1638 and proved October 30, 1638, and in it he gives his residence as St. Giles in the Fields. His alias of Hutchinson is well known from other sources.

WILLIAM BEESTON

1633 28 Oct. (Married) "William Beeston & Margrett Howson"
"P: L" in margin.

1636/37 17 Mar. (Buried) "Jone Beeston"

1637 27 June (Buried) "Mary Daughter of William Beeston"

1638 20 June (Christened) "William sonne of William & Margrett Beeston"

1638 7 Aug. (Buried) "William sonne of William Beeston"

1639 27 July (Buried) "A stilborn Child of William Beeston"

1641 20 June (Christened) "Robert sonne of William & Margrett Beeston"

1641 29 July (Buried) "Robert sonne of William Beeston"

1642 15 July (Married) "LC William Hutchinson alias Beeston and Alice Bowen"

1642 19 Aug. (Christened) "Elizabeth Daughter of William and Margrett Beeston"

1642 29 Sep. (Married) "William Hutchinson and Margrett Hilton"

¹ J. Q. Adams, *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert*, p. 28.

² B.M. quarto.

³ J. Q. Adams, *Shakespearean Playhouses*, pp. 348-51.

⁴ *Commonwealth and Restoration Stage*, p. 92.

PLAYERS OF ST. GILES IN THE FIELDS 153

- 1643 3 Dec. (Buried) "Elizabeth Daughter of William Beeston"
 1644 1 Apr. (Christened) "Jane Daughter of William and Alice
 Hutchinson als Beeston"
 1644/45 9 Feb. (Christened) "Margrett daughter of William and
 Margrett Beeston"
 1645 25 Apr. (Buried) "Margrett daughter of William Beeston"
 1647 25 June (Buried) "Jane daughter of William Hutchinson"
 1650/51 15 Feb. (Buried) "William Beeston"

William Beeston was the son of Christopher, and, according to the latter's will,¹ succeeded his father as manager of the players at the Cockpit. This was confirmed by the official appointment April 5, 1639.² He seems to have been connected with the stage as early as 1632, for on November 12, 1632, he and William Blgrave, one of the managers of the Salisbury Court, petitioned the Lord Chamberlain for the return of a boy, Stephen Hammerton, "inveigled from them by Christopher Babham & by him employed at the Blackfryars playhouse."³

His career as Governor of the company at the Cockpit did not last long, for on May 5, 1640, he was committed to the Marshalsea for allowing an unlicensed play to be acted.⁴ He was succeeded by William Davenant.⁵ He attained prominence again at the Restoration.

There must have been more than one William Beeston in the parish of St. Giles in the Fields. Surely the items concerning William Hutchinson *alias* Beeston point to the actor; the burial of February 15, 1650/51 obviously does not. I am uncertain about the others.

THEOPHILUS BIRD OR BOURNE

- 1638 27 Oct. (Buried) "Christopher son of Theophilus Bird"
 1642 27 Mar. (Buried) "Elizabeth Daughter of Theophilus Bird"

As his name is given as "Bourne" in early theatrical records,

¹ Leslie Hotson, *Commonwealth and Restoration Stage*, p. 92.

² So far as I know, this has not been published before. It is from Lord Chamberlain's Warrant Book 5/134, p. 326, at the Public Record Office. "A warrant to sweare M^r W^m Bieston his Ma^{ty}s servant in Ordinary in y^e Quality and vnder the Title of Gouuernor & Instructor of the Kings & Queens young Company of Actors. Apr. 5. 1639 A Certificate also for him."

³ Petitions to the Lord Chamberlain, 5/183, p. 128, at the Public Record Office, printed in an article entitled "Some Notes on William Beeston" by Allardyce Nicoll in *T.L.S.*, November 22, 1923.

⁴ J. Q. Adams, *Shakespearean Playhouses*, 360.

⁵ Warrant summarised by Mrs. Stopes in *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, vol. xlii, 1910, p. 103. Mrs. Stopes misread the date June 5, 1640. It should be June 27.

Collier conjectured that his baptism was recorded at St. Leonard's, Shoreditch, in the entry, "Theophilus Borne s. of William Borne", December 7, 1608.¹ His first certain connection with the stage is in the cast of Massinger's *Renegado*,² which was licensed April 17, 1624,³ and presented by Queen Henrietta's men at the Cockpit. He had a female part in this and in the second part of Heywood's *Fair Maid of the West*⁴ and in Nabbes' *Hannibal and Scipio*,⁵ both at the Phoenix. When the Queen's company broke up during the plague of 1636-7, Bird stayed at the Cockpit in Christopher Beeston's new King and Queen's young company, and May 12, 1637, was named in the Privy Council order prohibiting plays at the Cockpit during plague.⁶ Shortly after this he was admitted to the King's company upon bond.⁷ From Christopher Beeston's will of October 4, 1638, we learn that Bird had married Anne, the eldest daughter of the Cockpit manager. Christopher left a considerable legacy to the namesake grandson whose death followed his own so closely.⁸

Bird was one of the six King's men sworn grooms of His Majesty's chamber January 22, 1640/41,⁹ and then we lose sight of him until 1648, when with six of the old King's company he entered into a bond for payment of old debts, apparently in the hope of playing again.¹⁰ In 1652 he signed the deed of sale of the Salisbury Court from Herne to William Beeston as the latter's agent.¹¹ With Andrew Pennycuicke he published Ford's *Sun's Darling* in 1657¹²—our last glimpse of his activities.

RICHARD BROME

1642 16 Sep. (Christened) "Lucia Daughter of Richard Brome esq' and Sara vxor"

The obscurity of Brome's life makes it difficult to tell whether this may refer to the dramatist or not. His description of himself in *The Court Beggars* in 1632 as "the poet full of age and cares"

¹ Bodleian MS., mentioned Chambers, *Elizabethan Stage*, ii, p. 295.

² 1630 quarto B.M.

³ J. Q. Adams, *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert*, p. 28.

⁴ 1631 quarto B.M.

⁵ 1637 quarto B.M.

⁶ *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic*, 1637, p. 98.

⁷ Leslie Hotson, *Commonwealth and Restoration Stage*, p. 312.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 92.

⁹ Mrs. Stopes in *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, xlv, 1910, p. 103, gives a summary of this order.

¹⁰ Hotson, *Commonwealth and Restoration Stage*, p. 32.

¹¹ *Shakespeare Society Papers*, iv, p. 101.

¹² B.M. quarto.

might indicate that he was too old to be the father of Lucia. On the other hand, his connection with the Cockpit and his friendship for William Beeston¹ make St. Giles parish a not unlikely residence for him.

A Richard Brome was sworn groom of the chamber as player of Lady Elizabeth's company June 30, 1628,² but whether this was the resident of St. Giles or the dramatist, or both, I cannot discover.

WILLIAM CHAMBERS

1642/43 2 Mar. (Buried) "William Chambers"

Possibly the William Chambers whom Sir Henry Herbert exempted from arrest in 1624 as one of twenty-one "Musitions and other necessary attendantes" of the King's company.³

GEORGE CHAPMAN

1641 10 Aug. (Buried) "Richard servant to M^r Georg Chapman"
1652/53 26 Feb. (Buried) "m^r George Chapman"

These two entries are rather curious. The poet died in this parish on May 12, 1634,⁴ and Inigo Jones' monument to his memory now stands inside the church.⁵ There is no evidence that the dramatist had a son, and the residence of two men of the name in St. Giles may have been only a coincidence.

HUGH CLARKE

1627 6 May (Married) "Hugh Clark and Judith Brown alias Robins"

The first half of Clarke's career was with Queen Henrietta's men at the Cockpit; the last half with the King's men. In May 1626 he had a female part in Shirley's *Wedding*.⁶ He also appears as a Queen's man in the casts of Davenport's *King John and Matilda*,⁷ Heywood's *Fair Maid of the West*,⁸ and Nabbes' *Hannibal and*

¹ See *D.N.B.* account.

² Printed inexactly by Mrs. Stopes, *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, xlv, 1910, p. 94.

³ J. Q. Adams, *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert*, pp. 74-5.

⁴ See *D.N.B.* The record of his burial at St. Giles is in the register book which has disappeared.

⁵ The inscription has been recut. For a discussion of the original one, see Parton's history, p. 223.

⁶ 1633 quarto B.M. and Fleay's *Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama*, 1891, vol. ii, p. 236.

⁷ 1658 quarto B.M.

⁸ 1631 quarto B.M.

Scipio.¹ He is probably the "Clarke" whom Richard Kendall mentioned to Crosfield as one of the chief of Queen Henrietta's men.² This was in July 1634.

When Beeston formed his new company of boys at the Cockpit in 1637,³ the Queen's men were forced out and managed to survive only by joining forces with the players at the Salisbury Court.⁴ It was probably at this time that Clarke joined the King's men. He was sworn a groom of the chamber to attend as a player in January 1640/41.⁵ He was one of the King's men who signed the dedication of the Beaumont and Fletcher folio in 1647, and in January 1647/48 with six other former players of the King's company he entered into a bond for payment of the company's debt, apparently in a vain expectation of the reopening of the theatres.⁶

WILLIAM CONDALL

1647/48 5 Mar. (Christened) "Judith daughter of William and Elisabeth Condall"

Though we have no record that William Condall was ever an actor, he is of interest as the son of Shakespeare's famous fellow. According to the will of Mrs. Henry Condall—which I found recently at Somerset House—William Condall had a wife Elizabeth in 1636. This will speaks of the wild tendencies of William and directs the executors and overseers, John Lowen and Cuthbert Burbage, among others, that if "my said sonne William Cundall shall not amend his Courses but spend that estate and meanes which hee hath, then my will is that he shall onely have the said Twenty shillings unlesse his extreame poverty and need shall cause my said Executors or the survivors of them to afford him what in charity they shall think fitt."

JOHN DAUNCE

1635 7 June (Married) "John Dance & Mary Skooleing"
1640 18 June (Buried) "Ann Daughter of John Dance"
1640 4 Nov. (Buried) "John Dance"

John Daunce was sworn a groom of the chamber to serve as a

¹ 1637 quarto B.M.

² Dr. Boas in *Fortnightly Review*, April 1925, pp. 514-24.

³ J. Q. Adams, *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert*, p. 66.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ The warrant is summarised in *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, xlv, 1910, p. 103.

⁶ Leslie Hotson, *Commonwealth and Restoration Stage*, p. 32.

player to the Queen of Bohemia in 1629.¹ This is all that is known of his career as a player. Although next to nothing is known of this revived Lady Elizabeth's company, the earlier one had been connected with the Cockpit,² and St. Giles is a rather likely place for actors of the company. The name is sufficiently unusual to make identification not too risky.

EDWARD DAVENPORT

1638/39 9 Jan. (Christened) "Edward sonne of Edmond & Rebecca Davenport"

Davenport was connected with this neighbourhood in 1639, for on August 10 he was included in the ticket of privilege issued to twelve members of "ye young Company of Cockpitt Players".³ He had earlier appeared as a member of Richard Bradshawe's provincial company which was gaoled at Banbury in 1633 for playing with an alleged false licence.⁴ There are no other known records of his career.

NATHANIEL FIELD

1638 3 Sep. (Buried) "Elizabeth Daughter of Nathaniell ffield"
1638 23 Sep. (Buried) "Nathaniell field"
1639 7 June (Christened) "Nicolas sonne of Nathaniell Field"

I should like to know what connection, if any, this man had with Nathan Field, the actor-dramatist, or Nathaniel, his brother, the bookseller. Miss Brinkley has published a Letter of Administration for the goods of Nathan Field of St. Giles in the Fields, bachelor.⁵ This was granted in August 1620 and indicates the dramatist's decease before that date. Miss Brinkley also quotes⁶ a Letter of Administration for the goods of Nathaniel Field of St. Anne, Blackfriars, to his relict, Anne, in March 1632. Perhaps the man above was a son of the bookseller.

¹ Warrant summarised in *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, xlii, 1910, p. 95.

² J. Q. Adams, *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert*, p. 63.

³ So far as I know, this document has never been published. It is to be found in the Lord Chamberlain's Warrant Books at the Public Record Office, 5/134, p. 338. It reads as follows: "A Ticket or Certificate of p'viledge vnto y^e sevrall persons heerafter mentioned beeing of y^e young Company of at [sic] y^e Cockpitt Players (vizt) Robert Axon William Trig: John Lacie: Iohn Page, Michaell Moore: Robert Cox: Edward Dauenport: Ezechiell Fenne: Robert Shatterrell: Edward Gibbes: Iohn Wright Samuell Manuray: August 10. 1639"

⁴ *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic*, Charles I, ccxxxviii; *Malone Society Collections*, i, pp. 384-5; Murray, *English Dramatic Companies*, ii, pp. 163-7.

⁵ *Nathan Field, the Actor-Playwright*, 1928, p. 153.

⁶ *Ibid.*

WILLIAM GASCOIGNE

1641 16 July (Christened) "Alice Daughter of William & Alice Gascoigne"

1642 23 July (Buried) "Alice Daughter of William Gascoigne"

William Gascoigne was one of the twenty-one men whom Sir Henry Herbert exempted from arrest in 1624 because they were "all imployed by the Kinges Maiesties servantes in theire quality of Playinge as Musitions and other necessary attendantes".¹ Another reference to him is probably to be found in the stage directions of Massinger's *Believe as You List*, iv, i, when "Gascoigne: & Hubert" are directed to open a trap-door for Antiochus.² These two references indicate that he was not a player of any great importance.

EDWARD GIBBS

1641 7 Dec. (Christened) "Edward sonne of Edward and Jone Gibbes"

1641/42 3 Feb. (Married) "Edward Gibbes and Jone ffletcher"

1642/43 19 Jan. (Buried) "Mary Daughter of Edward Gibbs"

In 1634 Kendall told Crosfield that "Edw Gibbs a fencer" was one of the actors at the Salisbury Court.³ Five years later, on August 10, his name is in the list of "y^e young Company of Cockpitt Players" for a ticket of privilege.⁴ The second item above is a little puzzling. If Gibbs married a second wife Joan, it must have been very soon after the death of his first wife.

RICHARD HAWLEY

1630 8 Apr. (Married) "Richard Hawle and Margrett Gibbens"

1640 20 Nov. (Buried) "Richard Haley"

Our only record of the dramatic activities of Richard Halley or Hawley is to be found in the ticket of privilege granted to ten attendants of the King's players in January 1636/37.⁵ However, he must have been a player some time before this, for he is six times called a player in the registers of St. Giles Cripplegate between 1632 and 1636.⁶ His first appearance in those registers is as the

¹ J. Q. Adams, *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert*, p. 74.

² Edited by C. J. Sisson for the Malone Society, 1927.

³ Dr. Boas in *Fortnightly Review*, April 1925, vol. 117, pp. 514-24.

⁴ See above, note on Edward Davenport.

⁵ Inexactly summarised from the Lord Chamberlain's Warrant Book in *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, xlv, 1910.

⁶ See my article on the players in these registers *P.M.L.A.*, September 1929.

father of Roger Halley in December 1632, and his last as the husband of Sara Hawley in July 1639. These dovetail nicely with the above entries, if we assume that Sara was his second wife.

WILLIAM HEMINGES

- 1638/39 6 Feb. (Christened) "Ruth supposed Daughter of William Hanings & (blank)"
 1648/49 22 Jan. (Buried) "Edward sonne of William Hemings"
 1648/49 9 Feb. (Buried) "William sonne of William Hemings"

William Heminges, the ninth child of the famous leader of the King's men and first editor of Shakespeare, was baptised on October 3, 1602, at St. Mary's, Aldermanbury. He was educated at Winchester School and Christ Church, Oxford.¹ In 1630 he inherited his father's share in the Globe,² but his first play, *The Courser of a Hare, or The Madcapp*, according to Malone,³ was produced not at this theatre but at the Fortune in March 1632/33. His extant plays are *The Fatal Contract*⁴ and *The Jew's Tragedy*.⁵ He was probably dead in 1653, as Pennycuicke and Turner, publishers of *The Fatal Contract*, say in their preface, "This Poem was composed by a worthy Gentleman at hours of his recess from happier employments. In his life he was above the Sphere of common Writers, and though at death he left greater Monuments of his worth and ability, yet this piece had justly gain'd an esteem with men of excellent judgment."

These "greater Monuments of his worth and ability" are unknown. Interest has been attached to him in recent years through Professor Moore Smith's discovery⁶ that he is the author of the famous lines "On the Time-Poets."

RICHARD HETON

- 1639 28 Apr. (Buried) "A Crisom Child of Richard Heaton"
 1640 17 Nov. (Buried) "Hellen daughter of Richard Heaton"
 1641 26 Apr. (Christened) "Hellen Daughter of Richard & Elizabeth Heaton"

In February 1636/37 Richard Heaton was paid for three plays given at Court by "y^e company of y^e Players at Salisbury Court"

¹ D.N.B.

² See will, *Variorum*, iii, p. 191, and Sharers' Papers, Halliwell-Phillips, 1887, i, p. 312-19.

³ Adams, *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert*, p. 34.

⁴ 1653 quarto B.M.

⁵ 1662 quarto B.M.

⁶ *William Heminge's Elegy on Randolph's Finger*, 1923.

in October 1635 and February 1635/36.¹ He had probably taken over the management of the Salisbury Court theatre by this time, for in 1639 he made extensive notes concerning a new patent for the company at that theatre (Queen Henrietta's men). These notes emphasize the complete control which he proposed to exercise over the company;² it is not known whether he ever attained this despotic power.

If the Salisbury Court manager is the Richard Heaton who compounded for the estates of a recusant widow in the county of York in 1630 and 1631, he then lived in the parish of St. Clement Dane.³ Of course, this does not affect his identification with the man at St. Giles one way or the other. I have not found the name to be common in seventeenth-century London.

THOMAS JORDAN

1638 19 Sep. (Buried) "Richard sonne of Thomas Jordan "

He is better known as a poet and dramatist than as an actor, though he appeared in the list of the King's Revels company given at Norwich in March 1634/35⁴ and in the cast of the same company for Richard's *Messalina*.⁵ His interesting career during and after the Civil Wars is well known.⁶

The evidence is too scanty to identify him definitely as the father of Richard Jordan. A Thomas Jordan was married to Margery Macham in this parish in January 1616/17. This is much too early for the actor who was taking boys' parts in the thirties,⁷ and is evidence of a sort against the identification of the dramatist and the Thomas Jordan of this entry.

SAMUEL MANNERY

1638 28 Oct. (Married) " LC. Samuell Mannery & Mary ffinch "

1639 1 Sep. (Buried) " A Crisom Child of Samuell Manneroy "

1642/43 17 Mar. (Christened) " Samuell sonne of Samuell & Mary Manneroy "

¹ Quoted inexactly and with wrong reference in *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, xvi, 1910.

² These documents were printed with no hint of their source by Peter Cunningham in *Shakespeare Society Papers*, iv, pp. 95-100. They appear to be authentic.

³ *Calendar State Papers, Domestic*, 1629-31, p. 383; 1631-33, p. 120.

⁴ Murray, *English Dramatic Companies*, ii, 356.

⁵ 1640 quarto B.M.

⁶ See Seccombe's account in *D.N.B.*

⁷ See cast for *Messalina*, 1640 quarto.

PLAYERS OF ST. GILES IN THE FIELDS 161

- 1648 25 Sep. (Buried) "A stilborn Child of Samuell Manneroy."
- 1648 1 Nov. (Buried) "Samuell Manneroy"
- 1649 18 Apr. (Buried) "Ann Daughter of Samuell Manneroy"

The name is so unusual that it surely refers to the player who acted in *Holland's Leaguer*, given by Prince Charles's men at Salisbury Court, December 1631,¹ and who was mentioned in the ticket of privilege issued to the players at the Cockpit August 10, 1639.² He had a boy's part in *Holland's Leaguer*, but he is evidently listed in the ticket of privilege as a man.

THOMAS NABBES

- 1638 27 May (Christened) "Bridgett daughter of Thomas & Bridgett Nabs"
- 1641 6 Apr. (Buried) "Thomas Nabs"
- 1642 30 June (Buried) "Bridgett daughter of Thomas Nabs"
- 1643 29 Aug. (Buried) "William sonne of Thomas Nabs"

There is every reason to believe that these items refer to the dramatist. The name is quite uncommon; in fact, I cannot recall meeting with it before in seventeenth-century London registers. The last appearance of Nabbes is in his verses prefaced to Thomas Bedowe's *Poems Divine and Humane* in 1641, and the burial entry here fits well with the known facts of his life. Of his four acted plays, three were presented at the theatre in this parish, *Covent Garden* in 1632,³ *Hannibal and Scipio* in 1635,⁴ and *The Bride* in 1638.⁵

A. H. Bullen notices an eighteenth-century tradition that Nabbes was buried in the Temple Church, but investigation has failed to verify it.⁶

ANDREW PENNYCUICKE

- 1647 19 Oct. (Married) "Andrew Penneycuick and Dorothy kinde"
- 1652 4 Dec. (Buried) "A stilborne Childe of Andrew Pennicooke"

Andrew Pennycuicke, a bookseller and publisher during the Civil Wars and after, seems to have been a player in his early days. In 1655 he printed Davenport's *King John and Matilda* with the

¹ Adams, *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert*, p. 45, and 1632 quarto B.M.

² See note on Edward Davenport.

³ Title page of 1638 quarto B.M.

⁴ Title page of 1637 quarto B.M.

⁵ Title page of 1640 quarto B.M.

⁶ Bullen, *Works of Thomas Nabbes*, vol. 1, p. xii.

note, "my selfe being the last that that [sic] acted Matilda in it". The title-page of the 1658 quarto of Massinger's *City Madam* says that it was printed for Andrew Pennycuicke, "one of the actors". The first play was printed as acted by Queen Henrietta's company: the second was licensed to the King's men on May 25, 1632.¹ Probably Pennycuicke acted only as a boy. His residence in St. Giles cannot have been far from the theatre where Queen Henrietta's men had performed. He published a number of plays.

RICHARD PERKINS

1624/25	1 Mar.	(Married)	"Richard Parkins & Ellener Sanders"
1625/26	24 Jan.	(Married)	"Richard Parkins & katherin Wheeler"
1626/27	22 Jan.	(Married)	"Richard Parkins and Ann Ashbrooke"
1636	5 July	(Married)	"Richard Parkins & Susan Stephens"
1637	18 May	(Buried)	"Samuell sonne of Richard Perkins"
1637	3 June	(Buried)	"Richard sonne of Richard Parkins"
1638/39	24 Jan.	(Buried)	"Charles sonne of Richard Parkins"
1645	18 Aug.	(Buried)	"Susan wife of Richard Parkins"

Surely these entries cannot all refer to one man, but it is not unlikely that the actor resided in the parish of St. Giles in the Fields during this period. He was a member of Queen Anne's company 1602-1619,² and after the break-up of that company he is found variously connected with the Children of the Revels,³ the Red Bull Revels⁴ and the King's company.⁵ But in 1626 he is found as a member of the new Queen Henrietta's company at the Phoenix,⁶ and he remained with that company until at least 1641.⁷ For the first twelve years of its existence this company was at the theatre in Drury Lane, and it is not unlikely that Perkins took up his residence in the parish during this time. He was a well-known actor and a friend of Heywood and Webster.⁸

¹ Adams, *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert*, p. 34.

² Chambers, *Elizabethan Stage*, ii, p. 332.

³ Murray, *English Dramatic Companies*, ii, pp. 194-5.

⁴ Adams, *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert*, p. 63.

⁵ Mrs. Stopes in *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, 1910, vol. xlv, p. 93; and *New Shakespeare Society's Transactions*, 1877-79, App. ii.

⁶ Cast of Shirley's *Wedding*, 1633 quarto. For date see Fleay, *A Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama*, ii, p. 236.

⁷ *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, 1910, vol. xlv, p. 103.

⁸ See verses prefixed to Heywood's *Apology for Actors*, 1612 quarto; note appended to Webster's *White Devil*, 1612 quarto; cast of Davenport's *King John and Matilda*, 1655 quarto; preface to *Jew of Malta*, 1633 quarto; and Wright in *Historia Histronica*, Dodale's *Old English Plays*, ed. 1876, vol. 15, p. 406.

JOHN RHODES

1644 21 Oct. (Buried) "Ann Wife of John Rodes."

This evidently refers to the famous John Rhodes who set up the players at the Cockpit at the Restoration. Mr. Leslie Hotson has found that he was keeper of the Cockpit and lived in a small house adjoining it before 1644.¹ He may be the same as the "John Rodes of y^e fortune Playhouse" who was apprehended in 1639 for selling the plays of the King's company.² He may also be the same as the John Rhodes protected from arrest by Sir Henry Herbert along with twenty other musicians and other necessary attendants of the King's company in 1624.³

JOHN SHANK

1641 12 Oct. (Buried) "John sonne of John Shanks"

The famous King's player had a son who was grown when he made his will in 1635,⁴ and who is probably the John Shank, player, who was the leader of a travelling company at Norwich in the same year.⁵ "John Shaunks actor of the 'Fortune' playhouse" appeared twice before the Court of High Commission in connection with marital difficulties in February 1639/40⁶ and was sworn a player of Prince Charles' company in December 1640.⁷ Probably this is the "John Shanks player" who is reported in *A Perfect Diurnal* as having fled from battle in October 1642.⁸ The name is common enough to make the identification of the above none too certain.⁹

WILLIAM SHERLOCK

1638 21 Nov. (Buried) "William sonne of William Sherlock"

From 1622 to 1635, Sherlock was connected with the Cockpit,

¹ *Commonwealth and Restoration Stage*, pp. 90, 96, etc.

² I discovered this document in the Lord Chamberlain's Warrant Books at the Public Record Office, L. C. 5/134, p. 345. It reads as follows: "Another [apprehension] for Iohn Rodes of y^e fortune Playhouse vpon y^e complaint of the blackfryers Company for selling their Playes. eod [28 October 1639] 10s: Butler messeng[er]."

³ Adams, *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert*, pp. 74-5. But see the John Roads in my article *P.M.L.A.*, September 1929.

⁴ I have recently found the will at Somerset House, but it is too long to print here.

⁵ Murray, *English Dramatic Companies*, i, 274 and ii, 357.

⁶ *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic*, vol. cccxxxiv, fols. 96 and 106b.

⁷ *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, 1910, vol. xlvi, p. 103.

⁸ Collier, *Memoirs of the Principal Actors*, p. 279.

⁹ See my article in *P.M.L.A.*, September 1929.

in 1622 as a Lady Elizabeth's man ¹ and later as a member of Queen Henrietta's company.² The above entry probably refers to the actor, as Mr. Hotson says that for a time Sherlock was keeper of the Cockpit and lived in a house adjoining it. He does not give his source for this information, but apparently it came from one of the many Chancery suits he has unearthed.³ Herbert's Office Book says c. 2 October 1637 that Sherlock and four other leaders of the Queen's company at the Phoenix went to the Salisbury Court,⁴ and we know that the company there became the Queen's company.⁵

JAMES SHIRLEY

1641 29 May (Christened) "Michaell sonne of James & Elizabeth Sherley"

It is possible that this may refer to the dramatist who wrote many of his plays for the Queen's men at the Phoenix. He had returned from Ireland before the end of 1640⁶ and may well have taken up his residence in St. Giles in the Fields, though he had ceased to write for the players at the Cockpit.⁷ Although Shirley's will of 1666 mentions a wife Frances and no son Michaell,⁸ the son may have died, and Wood says⁹ that Frances was his second wife. The fact that Shirley fled to this parish after the great fire and died here¹⁰ is not incompatible with the notion that he had once lived in the parish.

WILLIAM TRIGG

1641/42 9 Jan. (Married) "William Trigg and Elisabeth Bird"
 1647/48 4 Feb. (Christened) "Thomas sonne of William and Elisabeth Trigge"
 1651 17 May (Buried) "Mathew sonne of William Trigg"
 1651 8 Nov. (Buried) "Thomas so: of William Trigg"
 1651 16 Nov. (Buried) "Elizabeth Da: of William Trigg"
 1652 28 May (Buried) "A stilborne childe of William Trigg"

¹ Adams, *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert*, p. 63.

² Shirley's *Wedding*, 1633 quarto; Davenport's *King John and Matilda*, 1655 quarto; Heywood's *Fair Maid of the West*, 1631 quarto; Nabbes' *Hannibal and Scipio*, 1637 quarto.

³ *Commonwealth and Restoration Stage*, p. 90.

⁴ Adams, *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert*, p. 66.

⁵ See *Shakespeare Society Papers*, iv, pp. 95-100.

⁶ A. H. Nason, *James Shirley, Dramatist*, 1915, pp. 117 ff.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 122 ff.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 158 ff.

⁹ Quoted *ibid.*, p. 162.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

Trigg played female parts in King's plays from 1626 to 1636.¹ He was Shank's apprentice, as the latter's will in 1635 says that the King's company owed him "Two and Twenty shillings for Trigg".² When Beeston's new company opened at the Cockpit, Trigg probably joined them from the King's men, for his name occurs second in the ticket of privilege issued in 1639 for "y^e young Company of Cockpitt Players".³ A satirical pamphlet of December 1642 gives us the information that Trigg was a Captain in the King's army.⁴

These register entries fit well with the known facts of his career. The marriage occurs within five or six years of the probable end of his apprenticeship,⁵ and there is a noticeable gap in the entries during the years Trigg was serving in the army.

JOHN TATHAM

1638/39 11 Mar. (Christened) "Amey Daughter of John & Joanna Tateham"

Nothing is known of the life of the poet and dramatist, and none of his plays can be connected with any pre-Restoration company. There is, however, no doubt that he was connected with the stage before the Civil Wars. His tragedy, *The Distracted State*, was written in 1641,⁶ and in his *Fancies Theatre* (1640 quarto) is "A Prologue spoken upon removing of the late Fortune Players to the Bull." In his volume of verse, *Ostella*,⁷ are two other prologues which indicate his connection with the stage: "A Prologue spoken at the Cock-pit, at the coming of the Red Bull Players thither" and "A Prologue spoken at the Red-Bull to a Play called the Whisperer, or what you please".

The name is not a common one in London registers of this time, and it is not too rash to suggest that Amey was the daughter of the city poet.

¹ *Roman Actor*, 1629 quarto; *Lover's Melancholy*, 1629 quarto; *Picture*, 1630 quarto; *Wildgoose Chase*, 1652 quarto; players' pass, inexactly summarised in *Shakespeare Jahrbuch*, 1910, vol. xli, p. 98.

² Unpublished will, Somerset House. For a discussion of his place in the King's company, see T. W. Baldwin, *Organisation and Personnel of the Shakespearean Company*, 1927.

³ See above, note on Edward Davenport.

⁴ Hotson, *Commonwealth and Restoration Stage*, p. 13.

⁵ It would be interesting if we could connect Elizabeth Bird with the theatrical family, but the only Elizabeth of that family known was the daughter of Theophilus, who died in St. Giles in the Fields in March 1642.

⁶ See the title-page of 1651 quarto.

⁷ 1650 quarto B.M.

ANTHONY TURNER

1636	26 Nov.	(Buried)	" Mary Daughter of Anthony Turner "
1639/40	8 Feb.	(Buried)	" Jone wife of Anthony Turner "
1641	1 Oct.	(Buried)	" Mary Daughter of Anthony Turner "
1642	4 Apr.	(Buried)	" Jane Daughter of Anthony Turner "
1650/51	19 Mar.	(Buried)	" A Crisom Child of Anthony Turner "

The first part of Turner's career is entirely connected with Drury Lane. In 1622 Herbert lists him with the Lady Elizabeth's company at the Cockpit,¹ and from 1626 to 1637 he played there with Queen Henrietta's company.² Turner was one of the chief of the new Queen's company formed for the Salisbury Court after the long plague closing of 1636 and 1637. He was named in the last known reference to that company (January 8, 1640/41) and then disappears until May 1651, when he and Edward Shatterel were summoned before the Sessions of the Peace for giving plays at the old Red Bull in Clerkenwell.³

WILLIAM WILBRAHAM

1644 4 May (Buried) " Avice wife of William Wilbraham "

Our first record of Wilbraham is the cast of Shirley's *Wedding*, presented by Queen Henrietta's company at the Phoenix ⁴ c. May 31, 1626.⁵ Adams thinks he was one of the original organisation of King's Revels for the new Salisbury Court in 1629,⁶ but c. 1630 he was in the cast for Heywood's *Fair Maid of the West* given by the Queen's company at court,⁷ and his first appearance with the King's Revels is at Norwich March 10, 1634/35.⁸ The fact that Christopher Beeston's widow Elizabeth in 1640 borrowed £150 from Wilbraham⁹ suggests that the actor may have been still living in this parish and combines with the rather unusual name to increase the probability that the above item refers to the player.

¹ Adams, *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert*, p. 63.

² Shirley's *Wedding*, 1633 quarto; Davenport's *King John and Matilda*, 1635 quarto; Heywood's *Fair Maid of the West*, 1631 quarto; Nabbes' *Hannibal and Scipio*, 1637 quarto; Adams, *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert*, p. 66.

³ Sessions of the Peace Roll, *Middlesex County Records*, iii, pp. 279-80.

⁴ 1633 quarto B.M.

⁵ Fleay, *A Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama*, ii, 236.

⁶ *Shakespearean Playhouses*, p. 374.

⁷ 1631 quarto B.M.

⁸ Murray, *English Dramatic Companies*, i, p. 279; ii, p. 356.

⁹ Hotson, *Commonwealth and Restoration Stage*, p. 94.

SPENSER AND THE ARTHURIAN LEGEND

BY CHARLES BOWIE MILLICAN

QUITE apart from the recognised indebtedness of *The Faerie Queene* to the Arthurian romances and to the Arthurian material in the chronicles, there are facts in connection merely with Spenser's use of the Arthurian legend that are worthy of notice. In respect to *The Faerie Queene*, the obvious Arthurian ferment that centred about the Tudors is not just a mere coincidence, for Spenser, who is of the Elizabethans Elizabethan, articulates the period in which he lived. The fact that Spenser used the Arthurian legend at all links him at once with the Arthurian interests of Tudor Englishmen, and we should well expect that certain special influences caused him to journey to Camelot during his formative period.

It is the consensus of opinion that in 1569 Spenser entered Merchant Taylors School, of which Richard Mulcaster was headmaster. W. L. Renwick, who has given the best discussion of the probable influence of Mulcaster on Spenser, writes as follows of Mulcaster's main educational work: "*The First Part of the Elementarie* was published in 1582, thirteen years after Spenser had gone to Cambridge, but Mulcaster, like every schoolmaster, was writing from long experience, and we may presume that Spenser was taught on somewhat these lines."¹ We may put in a like claim for Mulcaster's *Positions*, 1581, for it is in this work that Mulcaster makes a digression that is extremely significant for Spenser's future use of the Arthurian legend:

In the midst of so many earnest matters, I may be allowed to enter-mingle one, which hath a rellice of mirth, for in praying of *Archerie*, as a principall exercise, to the preseruing of health, how can I but prayse them, who professe it throughly, & maintaine it nobly, the friendly and franke fellowship of prince *Arthurs* knightes in and about the citie of

¹ Edmund Spenser, 1925, p. 15.

London, which of late yeares haue so reuiued the exercise, so countenaūced the artificers, so enflamed emulation, as in theselues for frindly [*sic*] meting, in workemen for good gayning, in companies for earnest comparing, it is almost growne to an orderly discipline, to cherishe louing society, to enrich labouring pouertie, to maintaine honest actiuitie, which their so encouraging the vnder trauellours, and so encreasing the healthfull traine, if I had sacred to silence, would not my good freind [*sic*] in the cite maister *Hewgh Offly*, and the same my noble fellow in that order Syr *Launcelot*, at our next meeting, haue giuē me a sowre nodde, being the chiefe furtherer of the fact, which I commend, and the famoset knight, of the fellowship, which I am of? Nay would not euen prince *Arthur* himselfe maister *Thomas Smith*, and the whole table, of those wel known knights, & most actiue *Archers* haue layd in their chaleng against their fellow knight, if speaking of their pastime I should haue spared their names? ¹

Mulcaster speaks of "the fellowship, which I am of," of "those wel known knights," and of "our next meeting" with evident familiarity, and gives us reason to believe that the "fellowship of prince *Arthurs* knightes" was prominent in the social life of Elizabethan London. That the fellowship had been "of late yeares" revived is verified by the licensing of a ballad by Edward White on August 19, 1579, the year of *The Shepheardes Calender* :

ye Renovacon of Archery. by. prince Arthure and his companions.²

But by far the most significant information on Prince Arthur's London knights is furnished by Richard Robinson.³ In 1582 Robinson published *A Learned and True Assertion of the original, Life, Actes, and death of the most Noble, Valiant, and Renowned Prince Arthure, King of great Brittain*, an English translation with additions of John Leland's *Assertio inclytissimi Arturij Regis Britanniae*, 1544. Robinson gave this translation a triple dedication: to Arthur, Lord Grey of Wilton, "then her Maiestyes Leevetenant generall in Ireland

¹ Pp. 101-102.

² H. E. Rollins, *An Analytical Index to the Ballad-Entries in the S.R.*, 1924, No. 2265, pp. 195-196. Cf. also Nos. 1746 and 1329, pp. 151 and 115, respectively, and "A Remembrance of the Worthy Show and Shooting by the Duke of Shoreditch, and his Associates the Worshipful Citizens of London, upon Tuesday the 17th of September, 1583" by one W.M. or W.H. in W. Wood's *The Bow-mant Glory; or, Archery Revived*, 1682, pp. 33-67, and T. Roberts' *The English Bowman*, 1801, pp. 253-275. The Duke's men and Prince Arthur's knights composed different organisations.

³ "Citizen of London," hack, and member of the Leathersellers Co. (fl. 1576-1600), and not to be confused with Richard Robinson of Alton (fl. 1574). Cf. *D.N.B.* In his *Eupolemia*, 1603 (B.M. MS. Royal 18. A. lxvi, fols. 5-13), Robinson gives a bibliography of his works.

who gave me here in London x s.,"¹ whom most scholars assume Spenser joined as secretary in 1580; to Sir Henry Sidney, the father of Sir Philip;² and to Thomas Smith,³ "Chiefe Customer for her Maiestie in the Porte of London," and

the Worshipfull Societie of Archers, in London yearely celebrating the renowned memorie of the Magnificent Prince ARTHVRE & his Knightly Order of the Round Table: . . .⁴

In the epistle dedicatory Robinson states that Henry VIII confirmed to the City of London

free electio of a Chieftaine and of Citizens representing the memory of that magnificent King Arthure, and the Knightes of the same order, which should for the mayntenance of shooting onely, meete together once a yeare, with solemne and friendly celebration thereof.⁵

Apparently Prince Arthur's London Round Table enjoyed, save for the strange interlude of Bloody Mary, a continuous existence to the reign of Elizabeth, for Robinson states further:

Neither hath this ceased in the branch, that flourished in the bole: but by the milde, religieuse, and gratiouse King Edward the VI. and now last of all by the Phenix of feminine sex, our most redoubted Hester and gratiouse soueraigne Ladie Queene Elizabeth laudably lasteth in force and effect: . . .⁶

The "redoubted Hester" herself, "Who came from Arthurs rase and lyne"⁷, helps to substantiate Robinson, for when she chanced to meet "a costly show of Prince Arthur, with his Knights of the Round Table" set in festive array by the Hugh Offley whom

¹ *Eupolemia*, ed. G. M. Vogt, *S.P.*, xxi (1924), 635. Lord Grey set sail from Ireland on August 31, 1582. Robinson's book was entered in the *S.R.* on June 7: Cf. Arber, *Transcript*, 1875, ii, 412.

² In 1579 Robinson dedicated to "Mr. Philip Sydney Esq." *The Reverend D. Philip Melanthon his prayers . . . with the prayers of other learned Germanes*. Vogt, *S.P.*, xxi (1924), 632.

³ Or Smythe, cf. *D.N.B.*

⁴ Sig. A2.

⁵ Sig. A4^v. The association of Arthur, the Round Table, and archery with the English royal house is as old as the Angevin dynasty. It is but a step from the fame of English archery at Crécy and Poitiers to a distinct archery club associated with Arthur in the reign of Henry VII, but the immediate suggestion of a Round Table of English archers under the leadership of a Prince Arthur no doubt grew out of the association of archery with Arthur, Prince of Wales, who, according to report, "became so expert in the use of the long-bow, that a good archer was honored by being stiled Prince Arthur." Roberts, *The English Bowman*, p. 86. Sir John Harington says of Arthur that "he instituted an order of the knights of the round table onely (as it seems) of some meriment of hunting, or some pleasant exercises." Notes to *Orlando Furioso*, 1591, p. 29.

⁶ Sig. B.

⁷ Thomas Churchyard, *The Worthines of Wales*, 1587, sig. D3.

Mulcaster has identified as Sir Lancelot and the "famoses knight" of the order, she gave them her royal commendation.¹

In 1583 Robinson brought out, with a dedication to Elizabeth and to Thomas Smith and the society of archers, *The Auncient Order, Societie, and Vnitie Laudable, of Prince Arthure, and his knightly Armory of the Round Table*. This work, in which Robinson reaffirms that

... ELIZABETH our Soueraigne QVEENE likewise, Confirms this Order still, and doth mentaine this exercyse,²

was devoted especially to the

now famous order of Knightes of Prince Arthures Round Table or Society,³

and was distributed among Prince Arthur and "his 56 knightes ... when they shott under the same Prince Arthure at Myles ende greene."⁴ Robinson based the book on a sort of text-book on heraldry, *La devise Des armes des Cheualiers de la Table ronde*,⁵ which is taken up almost entirely with the painted coats of arms of 168 knights of the Round Table. The main interest of Robinson's translation is that he adapts the French book for the purpose of advertising Prince Arthur and the London Round Table: the French book says nothing of Arthur's connection with archery. Robinson has fifty-eight blank shields numbered from one to fifty-eight, each surmounted by the name of an Arthurian knight, and to the right and left of all the shields, with the exception of five, are placed initials in Roman capitals, which no doubt refer to members of the London Round Table. That such is true is confirmed by Mulcaster's reference in the *Positions* to "maister Hewgh Offly, ... my noble fellow in that order Syr Launcelot,"⁶ and by the initials

¹ "Proclusion of 'Prince Arthur, with his Knights of the Round Table,' exhibited [in 1587] before the Queen," from an early seventeenth-century MS., pr. in John Nichols' *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, 2nd ed., 1823, ii, 529-530.

² Sig. B.

³ Sig. **2*.

⁴ *Eupolemia*, ed. Vogt, S.P., xxi (1924), 636.

⁵ Ed. Paris [1520?]. On fol. 161, B.M. MS. Lansd. 865, begins an incomplete transcript of an edition by "Barbe Regnault . . . printed at Paris 1559. 12."

⁶ Hugh Offley (or Offly, or Ofley, or Opeley), half-brother to Sir Thomas Offley and son-in-law of Robert Harding, was sheriff of London during the year of the Armada. In 1589 Robert Greene dedicated to him *The Spanish Masquerado* (two issues). Offley apparently succeeded Thomas Smith as Prince Arthur, for in the margin of Richard Niccols' *Londons Artillery*, 1616, p. 88, as a note to "Londons Prince Arthur," we find "Opeley Sheriffe of London." Cf. also C.S.P.D., 1581-90.

"H.O." on the page which Robinson devotes to "S. Lancelot du Lac."¹ It is therefore disappointing not to find the initials "R.M." by any one of the shields. But we have "their fellow knight's" own word to vouch for his membership, and it is possible that Mulcaster's name as a member was one of the five knights for whom there are no initials: "Blyomberyes de Gauues," "Messire Gaherryet," "Keux le seneschall," "Messire Iuaine," or "S. Bodovier of VVinchelsey."²

In 1581 Spenser had been away from Mulcaster's instruction for some twelve years, and was then in Dublin. Yet it is possible that Mulcaster had already become a member of the society of archers before Spenser left for Cambridge in 1569. In any case, Robinson's *A Learned and True Assertion* and his account of a London Round Table flourishing in memory of Arthur's traditional Table Round, and having, in addition, the commendation of Tudor sovereigns, help us to measure the vitality and popularity of Arthurian tradition in Tudor England. Spenser certainly knew of London's Prince Arthur and his knights of the Round Table, that society which did not escape the memory of Justice Shallow when Falstaff was enlisting recruits:

I remember at Mile-end Green, when I lay at Clement's Inn,—I was then Sir Dagonet in Arthur's show, . . .

To be able to postulate with reasonable assurance that Spenser went to grammar school under the tutelage of, say, "Messire Iuaine" Mulcaster indeed lends living colour to *The Faerie Queene*.

In 1569 Spenser entered Cambridge, of which in the fifteenth century Nicholas Cantelupe, "a Welch Gentleman," had claimed Arthur as the founder to offset the Alfredian tradition of Oxford. Cantelupe went so far as to give the text of a charter which he stated Arthur transmitted "per suum nepotem Walwanum."³ The fact that in 1568 a master of a Cambridge college reasserted the Arthurian foundation of Cambridge shows again the tenacity of Arthurian

¹ Sig. B^v. Cf. Sir E. Brydges, *The British Bibliographer*, 1810-14, i, 128, n. A merchant's mark in the central panel of the lid of a fine inlaid chest which was given by Offley to St. Saviour's, Southwark (now Southwark Cathedral), contains the initials "H.H.O.," i.e. Hugh Harding Offley.

² Nos. 8, 9, 10, 11, and 56, sigs. C, C^v, C₂, C₂^v, and I, respectively. Mulcaster has words "To the curteous Reader" in Robinson's *A Third Proceeding in the Harmonie of King Davids Harp*, 1595, sig. [A.4^v].

³ *De Antiquitate & origine Almae & Immaculate Universitatis Cantebriege*, ed. Thomas Hearne in *Thomae Sprotti Chronica*, 1719, pp. 268-269.

tradition during Spenser's apprentice period. In that year John Caius,¹ who was from 1559 Master of Gonville and Caius College, brought out anonymously his *De Antiquitate Cantabrigiensis Academiae libri duo*, to which he subjoined, also anonymously, a dissertation by Thomas Caius² on the antiquity of Oxford. In 1574—both the champions were then dead—during the fifth year of Spenser's residence at Pembroke, the 1568 edition was reprinted, evidently by Cambridge friends of John Caius, with John Caius's name on the title-page. An attempt at unravelling all the lines of argument would be irrelevant here. Suffice it to say that both John and Thomas quote extensively from the Arthurian chroniclers and that Thomas reaffirms the tradition that Oxford was founded by Alfred. This John denies, and asserts the antiquity of Cambridge by quoting in part "*diploma illud magni regis Arthuri*,"³ with only a few slight changes from Cantelupe's text. The Cambridge don does not reach the extremity of reaffirming Cantelupe's statement that Arthur's charter was delivered by Gawain, but the fact of significance remains that Spenser happened to be in residence at a university, which already had over a century of Arthurian tradition behind it, at the very time when it was aligned behind Arthur to the extent of open controversy.

In 1575, the year before Spenser was graduated M.A., Spenser no doubt met Richard Harvey, the younger brother of his tutor, Gabriel Harvey. Richard entered Pembroke in that year, and, significantly enough, published in 1593, with a dedication to the Earl of Essex and an explanatory note to his brother Gabriel, his *Philadelphus, Or A Defence of Brutes, and the Brutans History*. If human nature has not violently changed in 337 years, we do not have to tax our imaginations, what with John Caius's book besides, to postulate relevant discussions among the Cambridge students with Spenser in their midst. Harvey alludes to *The Faerie Queene* in the reference to the "*Vna* of all the women in the earth,"⁴ upholds against George Buchanan the "*markes and circuites*, that *Geffry*

¹ Cf. *D.N.B.*

² Or Key, whose reply remained in MS. during the controversy. Cf. *D.N.B.*

³ Ed. 1574, pp. 50-51. Leland evidently had heard of the forged charter. Cf. Robinson, *A Learned and True Assertion*, sig. E: "There is also (if we may beleue credible reporte) in the treasuries at Cambridge at this daye, a Table of the priuiledge by Arthure sometime confirmed to the furerace of studets." The parenthesis is Robinson's.

⁴ P. 32. This allusion to the heroine of Book I has not heretofore been pointed out.

Monmouth hath set downe,"¹ and stresses Arthur's "Magnificence and Magnanimitie";² and the reference to "an *Arthur* in paper-workes"³ in connection with some one of the numerous pamphlet-wars of the time again verifies the currency of the Arthurian legend in all the walks of Elizabethan life. The significance of Harvey's tract in relation to Spenser is apparent.

Among the points stressed, it is not supererogatory in relation to *The Faerie Queene* to stress again the contemporaneous existence of London's Prince Arthur and his knights of the Round Table. Especially when much is made of Spenser's living behind his age in the playground of mediæval romance, it is of singular moment that even on one occasion Prince Arthur and his knights while on their way to Mile End Green "did their duty upon their knee" before Elizabeth Tudor, and that she in return "most graciously bowed her body." If there is need to make clear Spenser's position in relation to the archer-knights, there need only be said that if the Elizabethan interest in the Arthurian legend is a part of a primitivistic movement which does have its ludicrous side, nevertheless this ludicrousness comes not from the fact that there was a revival of interest in the Arthurian legend. The ludicrousness comes, on the other hand, from the interests of the tradespeople. From this point of view, there is no inconsistency in Spenser, nor would he have violated his own high ground by becoming enthusiastic over such a gathering as Prince Arthur's London knights, in whose company the Arthurian knights of Edward III would have felt sadly out of place. Considered historically, from the very first prophecies of Arthur's return, as a sort of epic tradition, the association of the Welsh Tudors with Arthur becomes a national matter of serious import. That it reached down also into Mile End Green does not compromise the seriousness of the theme, just as Spenser's nobility is not compromised by any interest he may have had in such a democratic extension of an aristocratic tradition. From the point of view of the Renaissance theory of poetry, Spenser's use of Prince Arthur is founded upon the rocks of Parnassus, and he had no farther to turn than to Thomas Wilson's *The Arte of Rhetorike* for his authority:

If there be any olde tale, or straunge historie, well and wittellie applied to some man liuyng, all menne loue to heare it of life. As if one were

¹ P. 1.

² Pp. 88 ff.

³ Pp. 90-91.

called Arthure some good felowe that were wel acquainted with kyng Arthures booke, and the knightes of his rounde table, would want no matter to make good sport, and for a nede would dubbe him knight of the rounde Table, or els proue hym to be one of his kinne, or els (whiche wer muche) proue him to be Arthur himself.¹

London's "Magnificent" Prince Arthur, Master Thomas Smith, therefore, although he may not be to the satisfaction of scholars "*magnificence in particular . . . according to Aristotle and the rest,*" yet may serve as an humble prototype for Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, or for a composite picture of an Elizabethan captain, moving about Fairyland in quest of Gloriana, England's Tudor Fairy Queen. Maurice Kyffin's clarion call was answered :

Ye Bryttish Poets, Repeat in Royall Song,
(VVith waightie woords, vnde in King Arthurs daies)
Th' Imperiall Stock, from whence your Queene hath sprong ;
Enstall in verse your Princesse lasting prayes :
Pencerddiaid, play on Auncient Harp, and Crowde :
Atceiniaid, sing her prayeses pearcing lowd." ²

¹ Ed. 1567, fol. 74.

² *The Blessednes of Brytaine*, 1587, sig. [B4].

THE TEXT OF *SIR GAWAYN AND THE GRENE KNYȝT*

By S. O. ANDREW

THE three principal tests of the soundness of an alliterative text are : (1) alliteration, (2) rhythm, and (3) sense. I propose to apply these three tests, in this order, to certain passages in the text of *Sir Gawayn and the Grene Knyȝt*, as printed in Tolkien and Gordon's edition (Clar. Press, 1925) ; references are to the pages, notes, etc., in that edition.

1. *Alliteration*. —It will be well to begin with lines in which the second verse, having no alliterating letter, is admittedly defective. Many of these have been emended in this edition (see p. 121) ; the others are :

60 Wyle Nw ȝer watȝ so ȝep þat hit watȝ nwe cummen

The second " nwe " is feeble and is simply an echo of the first. I imagine the copyist had before him " was ȝonge cummen," which would make the alliteration normal. He may have taken the ȝ as the last letter of " watȝ."

157 Heme wel-haled hose of þat same grene

An instance of the common synonym mistake, as in the next four examples. Read " ilke " for " same " ; cf. the converse error in 1615.

541 Never þe lece ne þe later þay nevened bot merþe

Read " launced " for " nevened."

939 And he hym þonkked þroly and ayper halched oper

" Hiȝly," the natural adverb with " thonk," restores the alliteration.

971 Wyth leve laȝt of þe lorde he went hem aȝaynes

For " went " read " lent."

1422 þe hunte rehayted þe houndes þat hit first mynged
For "first" read "arst."

1962 Of such a selly sojorne as I haf hade here,
Your honour at þis hyge fest.

This is a little more difficult, but we have good sense if we read "as I assaide here" and delete the comma after "here"; "haf hade" is a corruption of "affaide," which governs "honour." For the construction of the subordinate clause, cf. 613; assay=to have proof of.

The editors take 60, 939, 1962 to be lines with two alliterating letters, instead of one; this type will be further discussed below.

We may now pass to lines in which the first verse has only one stave. About these opinions differ, but I cannot help feeling that they are far less numerous than is commonly supposed, for several reasons.

(a) Many of the lines (see p. 120) do alliterate, *e.g.*

25 Bot of alle þat here bult of Bretaygne Kynges
44 For þar þe fest wat3 ilyche ful fifteen dayes
1166 Ful erly bifore þe day þe folk uprysen [read "ar uprysen"]
2191 Wel biseme3 þe wyge wruhled in grene

This kind of alliteration is too frequent in the *A.P.* to be accidental, and I am convinced that adverbs and conjunctions like those given (and "when" used in correlation, *e.g.* 2249), could, *at the beginning of a line*, bear the stress.

(b) Other lines are suspect on grounds apart from the metre; they are either poor in sense or sin against linguistic usage, *e.g.*

93 Of sum auenturus thyng an uncouth tale
"thyng" offends: I believe that the copyist had before him something like *auenturusostyng*,¹ *i.e.* *auenturus hostyng*, and after taking the "os" to be the adverbial suffix he had to do the best he could with "tyng." The sense is now good (*hostyng*=foray) and the alliteration normal, "uncouth" being stressed on the first syllable pretonically.

649 In þe more half of his schelde hir ymage depaynted
Read "In the innermore half." There is no point in "more"; what the poet wishes to tell us is which *side* the image was on. Once

¹ Italics here and elsewhere represent a sign of abbreviation in the original.

more, the emendation makes both sense and alliteration good. "Inner" was omitted by haplography.

835 He sayde "Ȝe ar welcum to welde as yow lykes

This is the lord's first speech to his guest, and it is intolerably abrupt without the courteous vocative of address. Read :

He sayde "WyȜe, Ȝe ar welcum," etc. Cf. 252.

1169 Bi þay were tened at the hyȜe and taysed to þe wattres

It is long since they left "the hyȜe" and the "stablye" (1152), and I believe "at the trysteres" is the right reading; "loȜe trysteres" in the next line will then be distinguished from trysters generally.

1526 And Ȝe, þat ar so cortays and coynt of your hetes,
Oȝhe to a ȝonke þynk ȝern to schewe

"Schewe" is jejune, however taken; read "ȝelde," which is the right word for "carrying out" a promise, cf. *Cl.* 665 ȝelde þat I hyȝt. I think it probable that "knyȝt" has been dropped after "cortays."

1833 Noȝt bot arounde brayden, beten with fynȝres

The regular word in *A.P.* is not "arounde" but "aboute," which alliterates.

2439 Bot on I wolde yow pray, displeȝes yow never

What authority is there for "on" as a neuter pronoun? I suggest "prayer" after "on," which might easily be mistaken for the verb written twice over.

(c) Again, some of the lines are obviously incomplete, having too few stresses, and words readily suggest themselves which both give good sense and alliterate, *e.g.*

1187 Hit watȝ þe ladi, loflyȝest to beholde [leve ladi]

1293 Bot that Ȝe be Gawan hit gotȝ in mynde [gode G.]

1501 I am at yor comaundement to kysse quen yow lykes [I am knyȝt]

1909 And þer bayen hym mony bray houndes [bayen hym bremly]

1912 Bi þat watȝ comen þis compeyny noble [comen at þe crye]

2212 Thenne þe knyȝt con calle ful hyȜe [kenly þe knyȝt]

In the last example Gawain has just plucked up his courage, and a word meaning "boldly" is positively required; in 1293 the epithet is implied by the "so god as G." in 1297.

We come now to the double-riming lines mentioned above. Three (60, 939, 1962) have been already disposed of; as regards two of these, 939, 1962, I must add that it is to me incredible that any alliterative line in any period of English should have been tolerated with different alliterations in the two verses of the line. The remaining examples given (p. 120) are:

335 And wyth countenance dryze droȝ doun his cote (read dublet)
377 þen carpes to Sir G. þe kynȝt in þe grene

Read "gome in the grene." There are a fair number of lines in which the substitution of a synonym for a common word makes the alliteration normal, e.g. 992 "lord" for "kyng" (so in this edition), 157 *sqq.* above, 1372 below.

1223 Ȝe schal not rise of your bedde, I rych yow better

Read "boȝe of your bedde," as in Gawain's petition, 1220

1727 Ofte he watȝ runnen at, when he out rayked

The alliteration (ofte, at, out) seems to me perfect, though no doubt there is secondary alliteration also.

This completes our survey of supposed exceptions to the three-stave norm. I believe there *were* exceptions, but a careful reading has convinced me that they were rare, and, speaking generally, restricted to special cases, e.g. to lines containing proper nouns or words which begin with refractory letters such as *v*; they were never admitted, I feel sure, in "long" lines, i.e. in those with three stresses in the first verse. In such lines as

1372 Thenne comaunded þe lorde in þat sale to samen þe meny
1390 Tas yow þere my chevisaunce, I cheved no more
2149 Now fareȝ wel on Godeȝ half, Gawayn þe noble

we should write "segge" for lorde, "charge" for tas (cf. 863), "gode" for noble, in order to make the alliteration normal.

2. *Rhythm*.—Cæsura does not appear to be discussed in this edition, and I will therefore state very briefly my own conclusion on this important matter, viz. that the cæsura-pause was dominant and no other pause could override it. When therefore the pause at the cæsura was a barely perceptible one, just sufficient to emphasise the word before it, there was no other pause, and the line, so to say, ran straight on, e.g.

919 Syn we haf fonged þat fyne | fader of nurture ¹
 1884 As domeȝday | schulde haf ben diȝt on þe morn

If the cæsura-pause was longer, then subordinate pauses were admitted before or after, *e.g.*

1487 "What is þat?" quop þe wyghe, "Iwysse I wot never

We may now take some examples of the application of this rule:

76 Smal sendal bisides, a selure hir over
 Of tryed tolouise, of tars tapites innoghe.

Apart from the meaningless chiasmus, the rhythm of line 77, with its dominant pause in the first half-line, seems to me intolerable. We want, I think, a comma after "over" and no comma after "tolouise"; the second line is then in apposition to, and an amplification of, the first. What it exactly means is another matter. It might be a corruption of "of tryed toly & of tars," etc.; cf.

858 Tapiteȝ tyȝt to þe woȝe of tuly and tars

What authority is there for "tolouise" in the sense of "a silk" (note on 568)? The word is used in *Cleanness* for steelwork.

492 This hanselle hatȝ Arthure of auenturus on fyrst
 In yonge yer, for he ȝerned ȝelpyng to here

Since "hanselle" means New-Year's gift, "in ȝonge ȝer" is otiose if taken with the first line, while it is wanted in the second to qualify "ȝerned." For the projection of the emphatic phrase in subordinate clauses, cf.

1143 þay chastysed and charred on chasyng þat went
 1827 If ȝe renay my rynk, to ryche for hit semeȝ

723 Boȝe wyth bulleȝ and bereȝ, and boreȝ oȝerwhyte,
 And etayneȝ, þat hym anelede of þe heȝe felle.

Delete the comma after "etayneȝ"; the clause qualifies "etayneȝ" alone.

895 The freke calde hit a fest ful frely and ofte
 Ful hendely, quen alle þe hapeles rehayted hym at oneȝ
 as hende:

The correlation is wrong: point at the end of each line, and delete the comma after "hendely." "As hende" qualifies "calde," and

¹ I have given 919 as usually printed, but even here I should be inclined to point after fyne, making "that fyne" a substantive.

the meaning is "he called it a feast with the same courtesy as they showed him, when," etc.

2339 No mon here unmanerly þe mysboden habbez,
Ne kyd, bot as coveaunde at kynges kort schaped

Delete the comma after "kyd," and the sense is excellent. In all these examples the fault has been in the first verse of the line, in the following it is in the second :

209 A spetos sparpe to expoun in spelle, quoso myzt

Place the comma at the cæsura, after "expoun"; the meaning of the clause is "if one could find the right words."

822 Sere seggez hym sesed by sadel, quel he lyzt

Comma after "sesed," *i.e.* "till he could alight beside (or across) the saddle."

1199 To aspye wyth my spelle in space quat ho wolde

Comma after "spelle": I think the meaning of the clause is "what course she intended," cf. Chaucer, *Prolog.* 176, "helde after the newe world the space."

2041 To byde bale withoute dabate of bronde hym to were

Comma after "dabate," *i.e.* "so as to (by which to) defend himself from brand."

1099 And comfort you with compayny, til I to cort torne :
3e lende,

The bob must go with the line ; if we place a dash after "compayny" and delete the colon, the sentence after the dash sums up the previous lines.

3. *Sense, including grammar and linguistic usage.*

799 Upon bastel roves þat blenked ful quyte

Read "bryzt": "quyte" is tautologous, an echo from the previous line.

814 Then zede þat wyze azayn swyþe

"þat wyze" has crept in from the line above. The sense we want is "he went promptly and came back with speed": read

þen zede he zederly & azayn swyþe

In the second sentence "com" is easily understood from the context: "ȝederly" was dropped by haplography.

1303 I schal kysse at your comaundement, as a kyyȝt falles,
And firre, lest he displese yow, so plede hit no more

I think that a word denoting feeling is wanted before "lest." "Fere" would do, but "pine" which alliterates is better: the meaning is "as behoves a knight and as distress [behoves him] at the thought of displeasing you." The double use of the verb, personal and impersonal, in one sentence is characteristic.

1569 Bot in þe haste þat he myȝt he to a hole wynnez

"myȝt" is an echo from the previous line; read "in the haste þat he had," *i.e.* with all the speed he had.

1606 To unlace þis bor lufly bigynnez

Apart from the defective alliteration, one would expect a more expressive word than "bor" and I suggest "lodly," which might easily drop out owing to the proximity of "lufly." "Lodly" is used as a noun in *D.T.* (of a dragon), and for the thought cf. 1634 "let lodly þerat," said of Gawain when he handled the boar's head.

1723 Here he watȝ halawed when hapeles hym metten,
Loude he watȝ ȝayned with ȝarande speche

Reynard is at his wit's end between men (1723) and dogs (1724), and we should expect instead of "loude" an adverb to balance "here." I suggest "yonde": "here and yond," "here, there and yond" are common expressions, and the words might quite well be used distributively.

2122 I schal swer by God & alle his gode halȝeȝ,
As help me God & þe halydam, and oþeȝ innoghe

"God &" in 2123 seems to be redundant and may have crept in from the first line; he will (he says) swear by God, by the saints, "as help me the halidom," and any other oath. "By God and the halidom" is a comparatively late form of the oath.

2179 Debatande with hymself quat hit be myȝt

"byself" might easily drop out by haplography after hȝself: it restores the alliteration.

Finally, a few examples in which the reading is affected but not the alliteration :

1265 And other ful much of oþer folk fongen hor dedes

Is not "redes" the right reading, "fongen hor redes" being simply a variant of the common expression "take their rede"? I think "and" = if or whereas, and that "ful much" should be "fele".

1351 To hewe hit in two þay hyzes

"Hyzes" is asserted (Introd. p. xxiii) to be a Northern form; can any other example with the conjunctive pronoun be found? I would read "thay hyze," and "þyze" (generic singular) in 1349: cf. the modern "boot o' th' arm."

1447 Mony was the miry mouthe of men and of houndez

"mouthe" surprises, and is obviously a stray from the previous line. Read "lote" or "note."

1969 "In god fayþe" quop þe god mon, "wyth a goud wylle"

The threefold alliteration on "good" is hardly credible in so resourceful a poet, and I feel sure that both here and elsewhere (e.g. 1635, 1955) "god mon" is one word (=host). Probably we should also read some synonymous phrase for "in god fayþe," e.g. "on Godes name."

1729 And 3e he lad hem, bilagged men, þe lorde and his meyny

I see no sense in "3e," which should obviously be "3et"; "men" spoils the rhythm (the MS. "mon" has probably sprung from "mounte" just below) and should be omitted. "Bilagged" must surely go with "he"; the meaning is "and still, harried and bedraggled as he was (cf. the whole passage), he led them," etc.

2320 Never syn þat he wat3 burne borne of his moder

Read "Never syn þat he had barne ben," which incidentally makes the alliteration complete.

2511 For non may hyden his harme bot unhap ne may hit

The simple emendation "mon" for "non" removes all difficulty: "a man may hide his misfortune but cannot undo it."

NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

STEELE'S *CHRISTIAN HERO* AND THE ERRATA IN *THE TATLER*

WHEN Mr. Bateson's article on "The Errata in *The Tatler*" came out in the April *Review of English Studies*,¹ I happened to be engaged in collating the first eight editions of Steele's *Christian Hero*. This collation yields evidence about Steele's habits of composition and revision which bears directly on the question discussed in the article.

Mr. Bateson's contention is that Nos. 104, 151, 221, 222, and 227 of *The Tatler*, for which in the original folio there were lists of errata (calling chiefly for stylistic revisions), were written partially or wholly by Addison.² This contention rests primarily upon the well-known tradition that Addison was in the habit of making frequent stylistic corrections in his work. In support of it, Mr. Bateson points out that the periods of Addison's residence in London coincided with those when errata lists appeared; that for a number of papers known to be his there were similar lists; and that the themes and the style of the questioned papers are characteristic of his work.

Throughout the discussion runs the implicit argument that Steele, who according to tradition did not take the pains to revise his work after it was once in type,³ would have been extremely unlikely to make such minute stylistic changes. The truth is, however, that at this very period he was engaged in making similar revisions in the third edition of the *Christian Hero*. The first edition of this essay appeared in April 1701, the second in July of the same year, and the third in November 1710. Both the second and the third

¹ R.E.S., v., 155-66.

² These papers were not included in Tickell's edition of Addison. But two of them (Nos. 151 and 222), together with ten or eleven others, were tentatively ascribed to Addison by the editors of the 1786 edition of *The Tatler*, on the basis of the errata lists. See the notes to Nos. 77, 151, 222, 241 in *The Lucubrations of Isaac Bickerstaff, Esq.* . . . London, 1786.

³ This tradition was also cited by the editors of the 1786 edition of *The Tatler* as strong presumptive evidence that Steele did not write the papers for which there were errata lists. See iii, 19-21; iv, 255; iv, 302-307.

editions were carefully corrected and revised. In addition to the correction of numerous careless slips in printing, there were, in this small octavo volume of ninety pages, more than thirty stylistic alterations in the second edition and sixty-five in the third. These changes were made in order to avoid awkward repetitions, to substitute more exact words, to eliminate redundancies, and to expand hasty or colloquial expressions. A few examples will indicate how similar in character were these alterations to those called for in the *errata* of the *Tatler* papers under consideration.

A characteristic form of revision in both essay and periodical was substitution in diction. In the *errata* of *The Tatler*, these directions were given: "for upon, read to" (No. 152 for No. 151); "for Emersions, read Immersions" (No. 222 for No. 221); "for very ancient Extraction, read great Antiquity," "for Way, read Method," "for Nocturnal, read Midnight" (No. 223 for No. 222); "for born, read made" (No. 228 for No. 227). Similarly, in the second edition of the *Christian Hero*, "Imbib'd" was changed to "receiv'd" (Dedication); "discourse" to "Essay" (Preface); "nobler Being" to "conscious Being" (p. 33);¹ and "an Harmony . . . which drowns the Incapacities of the parts" to "a certain Beauty . . . which covers the disagreeableness of the parts" (p. 54). In the third edition, "apt" was changed to "adapted" (p. 69; p. 63); "proverbial for it" to "of it" (p. 69; p. 63); "their City" to "the City" (p. 61; p. 55); "under Poverty" to "of Poverty" (p. 79, p. 86; p. 78); and "that that Person" to "that such a Person" (p. 53, 2nd ed.; p. 48).

Deletions were frequent. Directions in the *errata* of *The Tatler* reading "Col. 2, Line 4, *dele* immediately" (No. 222 for No. 221); "In the last Line of the first Column, *dele* or have a Mind to take their Rest" (No. 223 for No. 222); and Col. 2, Line 22, *dele* that of (No. 152 for No. 151) have their counterpart in changes made in the essay. For example, in the second edition, "easily" was omitted from "could not easily admit of Composure" (p. 13); "as such" from "a Mediator, who as such is unconcern'd" (p. 59); "there" from "that yoke in which alone there is perfect Freedom" (p. 60). In the third edition, "to it" was dropped from "which may, Imperceptibly to it, Act upon it" (p. 32; p. 29); "ever" from

¹ A single page number refers to both first and second editions. When two or more page numbers are given, the last refers to the third edition, those preceding to the two earlier editions.

"there seldom ever lives a person" (p. 79, 2nd ed.; p. 71); "now" from "its State is now as much Militant as ever" (p. 79, p. 86; p. 78); "near him" from "by turning the Stones near him into Bread" (p. 42; p. 38).

Three-fourths of the revisions in the *Christian Hero* consisted of the rewording and rearrangement of phrases and clauses. In the second edition, "told where only I should find it" was altered to "inform'd where only it was to be had" (Preface); "Methods we are already In" to "Methods we are already Engag'd in" (p. 3); "for it's extirpation" to "for the extirpation of it" (p. 17); "arriv'd they" to "they arriv'd" (p. 7); "he . . . beholds his Prisoners detain'd by their amazing Liberty" to "he . . . beholds his Prisoners detain'd by nothing but their amazing Liberty" (p. 60). In the third edition, "after he had express'd" was changed to "after having express'd" (p. 29; p. 27); "as Dead drag'd him" to "drag'd him as Dead" (p. 57; p. 52); "hatred always sees things" to "Hatred doth always see Things" (p. 86, p. 93; p. 84); "He soon consented *Caesar* deserv'd to Die" to "He soon consented that *Caesar* deserv'd to Die" (p. 18; p. 17); "a sad impression this made upon him" to "a sad Impression which this made upon him" (p. 26; p. 24); "to capacitate for this hard work" to "capacitate ones self for this hard Work" (p. 52; p. 47). These alterations, and many more like them, are surely as painstaking as the four similar *errata* in *The Tatler*: "for desired to, *read* desired me to"; "for not so much because, *read* not only because"; "for Lady whom, *read* Lady whose Name" (No. 105 for No. 104); and "after love him, *read* as I know he does me" (No. 228 for No. 227).

Now, if Steele took the pains—in these busy years of 1709–10—to revise for the second time an old piece of work, is it not reasonable to believe that he was as likely as Addison to provide *errata* for *The Tatler*? At any rate, this evidence of his literary conscience and industry and indeed of the striking similarity in character between the two sets of alterations challenges Mr. Bateson's statement that "There can be no doubt that it was Addison who was primarily responsible for the appearance of *errata* in *The Tatler*." And the central argument thus weakened, the argument for the ascriptions must depend entirely upon the validity of the supporting evidence.

RAE BLANCHARD.

Goucher College,
Baltimore, Maryland.

GEORGE STEEVENS AND ISAAC REED'S *BIOGRAPHIA
DRAMATICA* : FURTHER NOTES

(1) When I wrote my article (*R.E.S.* vol. 5, 1929, pp. 288 ff.), I accepted Sir Sidney Lee's statement that Steevens "contributed an appreciative notice of Garrick to Baker's *Biographia Dramatica*" (*D.N.B.* s.v. Steevens). I find, however, that rather more than two-thirds of this notice is taken over from the first edition, Baker's *Companion to the Play House*, published in 1764, and that the greater part of the remainder is compiled from Tom Davies's *Memoirs of Garrick*, first published in 1780. It is not certain that Steevens was the compiler of the article in Reed's edition—Nichols says that he was—but whether he was or not, the praise of Garrick contained in it cannot properly be ascribed to him. Nichols printed nearly the whole of the article in his *Biographical and Literary Anecdotes of John Bowyer* (1782, pp. 285 ff.), with the addition of some decidedly unfriendly notes, signed "T. F.", and the intercalation of a long paragraph charging Garrick with parsimony; and when he reprinted it in the greatly enlarged edition, the invaluable *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*, he added to the depreciatory paragraph the note: "Need I say that this paragraph was written by George Steevens" (*Lit. Anecd.* ii, 319). Davies thought that the "T. F." who wrote the notes was also Steevens, but Nichols says (*Lit. Anecd.* vi, 433) that these initials "designated Dr. Taylor's Friend, now known to be the late Rev. George Ashby."

(2) The story that Horace Walpole laid an embargo on his tragedy, *The Mysterious Mother*, as far as Garrick and Johnson were concerned, seems to have had some foundation. Writing to the Countess of Upper Ossory, October 4, 1787, Walpole himself says: "This very month a magazine has republished a tale which I do not remember, and of which I will swear part is false. It is that many years ago I gave Mr. Beauclerk my tragedy, with injunctions not to show it to Garrick and Dr. Johnson." He proceeds to express his doubts of the story, but he does not categorically deny it. See his *Letters*, ed. Paget Toynbee, xiv, 25.

L. F. POWELL.

A MANUSCRIPT OF WILLIAM BROWNE

MS. ASHMOLE 767 in the Bodleian is a composite volume and contains two books formerly belonging to William Browne, and each inscribed with his name. Both signatures are decoratively done in the slender wavering italic he used for such moments of formality. In all the 103 folios of the former of the two MSS. the phrase "Liber: Willi: Browne." on 21 recto is the only mark of his ownership. The rest of the MS. is in a violent, inky "secretary" hand not his. The writing of the latter MS. is entirely in Browne's hand—his italic hand.

The two MSS. fall naturally together. Both are conveniently described as compilations of "vegetable emblems" in the Bodleian catalogue. The first opens with a painted square representing the arms of Lord Burleigh (v. Bod. catalogue). It is this folio that Browne has signed. Then follows a series of painted emblems, about two inches square, representing a Latin or English motto pictorially. Underneath these squares are doggerel verses which may be in the author's own hand, since current corrections are fairly frequent. The MS., then, looks something like the autograph origin of such books as Wither's *Collection of Emblemes*. After about 120 pictures the devising brain or executive hand gives out and there are no more. Verses, however, continue and a space is left for the emblem to be painted in. But later the verses are crowded together. Emblem 169 may provide a clue to authorship. It is inscribed, "To his deere freend Mr Nicholas Rosecarrot". The name is used as vegetable copy, the first line reading

The Rose and Carrot bothe be sweete.

And then follows another set of verses, "Againe of and to the same".

The second MS. is similar. The arms of Burleigh appear on 3 recto, a cancel pasted over the square providing the artist, whoever he was, with a second shot. The verses stop after 14 recto, but the painted squares continue up to 103 recto, with gaps at 67 recto and 87 recto. A few of the squares are replicas of earlier ones already provided with mottoes and verses. They derive from the former MS. until it fails. The last half-dozen emblems change the style and technique. They are far from being merely vegetable; one is heavily gilded, another silvers its moon, and the last seems almost

Flemish in the elaboration of its landscape background. They are thickly painted as if in oils and, unlike the preceding ones, have mottoes.

Comparing this MS. with the former, one notes that the majority of the emblems are the same, and their detailed drawing the same, only the touch is much neater and more elegant, and the colours fresher. The mottoes are the same. But the verses, though limited to illustrating the same theme, are different in several ways. They differ in length, the verses of Browne's MS. being usually longer. Sometimes the theme of the motto is treated in an entirely new way. In Emblem 19, *e.g.*, the motto "*Arbor non semper fructu nascitur*" is symbolised through the story of a witty idiot before the judge: the corresponding emblem is not narrative. The verses transcribed by Browne are mainly in pentameter couplets instead of ballad measure, are always decent verse and sometimes good verse. As in the former MS., verbal changes are made currently in a way which of itself suggests autograph (*e.g.*, in Emblem 6). The order of the emblems is different in the MSS.

The relation of the two MSS. is obscure, but may be guessed at. Browne, as the signatures show, owned both of them, and wrote the whole of one. It seems likely that he used the former as copy for the latter. Browne's hand was habitually exquisite, and I think the painting, as well as the handwriting, is probably his own doing.

A comparison of corresponding emblems will illustrate the foregoing. The first MS. has 8 doggerel lines versifying the motto "*Deposuit potentes de sede*", and a painted drawing of a fir tree perched on a mountain top. Emblem 15 of Browne keeps the motto and the picture, but reads :

The loftie firhes which on the Mountaynes growe
As standinge to survaye the Vales belowe,
Assoone are cutt downe by the Workemans hande
As other Trees which in the Bottome stande,
Soe are those men sett on the toppe of state
Whome Vainelie some intitle fortunate,
As soone deicted, men that stand soe highe
Furthest from earth and neerest to the skye ¹
The thunder euer ² strikes, before it can
Descend soe lowe to kill the meaner Man.

¹ The final "e" is trailed on by the pen probably to serve as punctuation.

² "euer" is written above a cancelled "soonest."

The same kind of changes are noticeable between Emblem 13 of the first MS. and Emblem 4 of Browne's. The latter reads :

Luxurians corpus animū debilitat.

[*Painted emblem*]

When Aprill showres the Plowman's lands adorne
In suites of green, a gallant cropp of Corne.
If yt be ranck at first, he still doth feare
The stalke will be too greate, too small the care,
Therefore to eate it downe doth often keepe~
A day or two thereon, his flocke of Sheepe
Soe should the lazie impe be bitt with rodds
Soe should all ¹ pampred, drousie, Belly godds
Be prest with laboures. Whoe alone delight
To glutte their Mawe and please their Appetite.
Whiche eate to drinke and drinke to eate. We finde
The Well ²-fedd body hath a starued mynde.

A reader of Browne will note the resemblance between these poems and the printed poems of Browne, especially his *Visions*. They are mainly in pentameters, his favourite measure, and show his sententious turns, his fluent expression, his occasional gift for epigram. The themes are sometimes favourite ones; the emblem on 5 recto touches on the maidenly ritual of the marigold; that on 14 recto employs a characteristic simile, the kind based on observation as narrow and curiously intensive as Peter Breughel's. Emblem 11 strikes a theme which, after the part failure of Book One of *Britannia's Pastorals*, was almost an obsession of Browne and his friends.

Depressus, extollor.

[*Painted emblem of a cherub swinging on a palm tree*]

Though base detraction stuff'd with poysonous words,
Should striue to spend his ranckled gore on me,
I glorie much that any Muse affords
Me, ought worth enuie, or my Poesie :
I, with the Palme shall ever (*sic*) stand and be
Assured of my selfe, and sett my rest
Enuie's a thinge, allotted, to the best.

And one poem is found incorporated in the printed works of Browne. Emblem 17 takes for motto "*Periit memoria eius vna cum Sonitu.*" Ps. 9. 6," and reads :

¹ "all" is written above a cancelled "the."

² The latter "l" of "Well" is carried forward to act as a hyphen.

That man whoe onlie liu'd ¹ to liue noe more
 And dy'd ¹ still to be dyeinge, whose cheife store
 Of Virtue was, his hate did not pursue her
 Because he neither heard of her or knewe her.
 That knewe noe good but onelie by his sight
 Sawe euerie thinge had still his opposite. 5
 And therefore ² this his apprehension ³ caught,
 That what he did was good the other naught,
 That alwayes lou'd the man, which neuer lou'd
 And hated him, whose hate noe death had mou'd, 10
 Yet he himself at fittinge tyme and season
 Could hate the traitor and yet loue the treason.
 That many a woefull hart (ere his decease)
 In pieces tore to purchase his owne peace.⁴
 Whoe neuer gaue his almes but in this fashion 15
 To salue his credit more than for saluation.
 Whoe on the names of good-men alwayes fed,
 And most accursed sold the poore for bread.
 Rightlike the Pitch-tree from whose any lym
 Come's neuer twigge so shall it be with him, 20
 The Muses scornd by him laughe at his fame
 And none will once ⁵ vouchsafe to speake his name,⁶
 Lett no man for his losse one teare lett fall,
 But perish with him his Memoriall.

These lines are substantially the same as lines 705 ff. of *Britannia's Pastorals*, Book II, Song 4. I quote them from the first edition, 1616:

A man that onely liu'd to liue no more,
 And dy'de still to be dying. Whose chiefe store
 Of vertue, was, his hate did not pursue her,
 Because he onely heard of her, not knew her.
 That knew no good, but onely that his sight 5
 Saw euery thing had still his opposite.
 And euer this his apprehension caught,
 That what he did was best, the other naught.
 That alwayes lou'd the man that neuer lou'd,
 And hated him whose hate no death had mou'd. 10
 That (politique) at fitting time and season
 Could hate the Traitor, and yet loue the Treason.

¹ These verbs were first written as "liues" and "dyes".

² "therefore" is caret above the line.

³ The word was first written "apprehension" and the missing letters were caret above later.

⁴ The period is doubtful.

⁵ "once" is caret above the line.

⁶ This line stood originally: "And noe man will vouchsafe. . . ." The next line explains the change.

That many a wofull heart (ere his decease)
 In pieces tore to purchase his owne peace.
 Who neuer gaue his almes but in this fashion, 15
 To salue his credit, more then for saluation.
 Who on the names of good-men euer fed,
 And (most accursed) sold the poore for bread.
 Right like the *Pitch-tree*, from whose any limbe
 Comes neuer twig, shall be the seede of him. 20
 The *Muses* scorn'd by him, laugh at his fame,
 And neuer will vouchsafe to speake his Name.
 Let no man for his losse one teare let fall,
 But perish with him his memoriall ! (Sig. O4'. 11 ff.)

The details of divergence suggest that the MS. version is the earlier. It was not copied down with unhesitating certainty. At the opening couplet of the emblem the tense of the verbs was changed from present to preterite, probably at the time, since the later verbs are written down straightway as preterites. Lines 7 and 22 caused trouble and are different and smoother in the printed text. Lines 8 and 11 are firmer and subtler in meaning, line 20 is cast with much more skill, line 17 turned more musically in the printed text. I think the application of the pitch tree symbol shows most strongly of all that the MS. poem came first. The pitch tree is indispensable in the MS. and rather otiose and far-fetched in the printed passage.

But the main point is that this emblem is demonstrably an original poem by Browne. And so probably are the others in so far as they diverge from those of A.

GEOFFREY TILLOTSON.

THE RELATION OF SHIRLEY'S PROLOGUE TO ORRERY'S THE GENERALL

In the volume of the poems of James Shirley, published in 1646, there are included a number of prologues written by Shirley for plays produced at the Werburgh Street theatre, Dublin, between 1636, when he went to Ireland to be playwright for that theatre, and 1641, when civil war broke out there and put an end to theatrical activities. One of these prologues is headed: *To a Play there, called The Generall*. It was this prologue which led J. O. Halliwell-Phillips to attribute to Shirley's authorship the old play, entitled

The Generall, he discovered in manuscript and printed in 1853. Subsequently this play was identified beyond question as the creation, not of Shirley, but of Roger Boyle, Earl of Orrery. As a result, the theory was advanced that the play was written by Orrery before 1642 and produced in Dublin prior to the Civil War. The Rev. Montague Summers, without any evidence in substantiation, went so far as to imply in 1917 that this theory was indeed actual fact.¹ In two recent articles on *The Generall*² I had thought to destroy completely the above theory by establishing with rather strong certainty that *The Generall* was written by Orrery at Dublin early in 1661 and acted for the first time in a private performance there the fall of 1662. Not long since, however, Professor Allardyce Nicoll raised the ghost of the old theory and devoted a considerable note to the point in the revised edition of his *History of Restoration Drama*.³ Therein he remarks that Mr. Clark "completely ignores the important prologue written by Shirley." He goes on to say that "there is undoubtedly a possibility that the two plays [*i.e.* the one for which Shirley's prologue was written, and Orrery's drama] were one and the same."

Yet there are several considerations which militate against any such possibility and which Professor Nicoll seems not to have regarded fully. For example, it would not be easy to explain why Roger Boyle should write before 1642 a play entirely in verse of rimed couplets, when such a style of dramatic composition at that time would have been surely very much of an innovation, and the piece itself an unique theatrical novelty. Or again, it would be difficult to suggest how Thomas Killigrew was able to procure the manuscript of *The Generall*, to present it in 1663 to Sir Henry Herbert for licensing as a new play, and to secure such a licence, if John Ogilby, who was still a theatrical producer in Dublin after the Restoration, had brought out Orrery's play at the Werburgh Street theatre twenty years previously.

But important as are these considerations, the facts about Orrery's life from 1636 to 1642, which have been little known and entirely ignored in consequence, are of even larger import in connection with this question. When carefully viewed, they give grounds for dispelling any thought that *The Generall* was written and acted in Dublin previous to 1642. On February 13, 1636, when Orrery,

¹ *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, xii, 224.

² *R.E.S.*, ii (1926), 206; *M.L.N.*, xlii (1927), 381.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 379.

then Lord Broghill, was still fourteen years of age, he in company with his brother, Lewis, and a tutor, left Dublin for study and travel in Europe.¹ He did not return from the Continent until 1639, reaching London on March 4.² During May and June he took part in the war against the Scotch,³ and then spent the summer at Stalbridge, Dorsetshire, with his father, the Earl of Cork, and family.⁴ On October 4, 1639, the Cork family took up residence in London,⁵ where for the two ensuing years Broghill was occupied with the delightful distractions of Charles I's court or engaged for some months at a time in further military expeditions against the Scotch. Finally, on September 21, 1641,⁶ Broghill departed with his wife and father for Ireland and arrived at Lismore Castle, his father's residence in Munster, on October 19, 1641.⁷ Four days later the Irish Rebellion broke out in the north, and civil war had begun. This hasty biographical summary clearly shows that between 1636 and 1642 no connection of Orrery with the Dublin stage can be plausibly conceived. He had not visited Dublin since he was fourteen, and he had left there before Ogilby or Shirley had appeared on the scene, so that he could not have been acquainted with either of them. The records do not reveal even the slightest likelihood of a dramatic composition by Orrery during those six very youthful years of varied activity and interest in diverse places.

When all available evidence is marshalled together, it would seem to indicate conclusively that any relation between the play for which Shirley's prologue was written and the drama by Orrery of the same name is really based upon a hypothesis so far-fetched as to be ruled even out of the realm of possibility.

WILLIAM S. CLARK.

DRYDEN'S VERSES "TO THE LADY CASTLEMAIN,
UPON HER INCOURAGING HIS FIRST PLAY"

THESE verses have hitherto been printed in the various editions of Dryden's *Poems*, in accordance with the text which appears in *Examen Poeticum*, the Third Part of what is conveniently called "Dryden's Miscellany," 8vo. 1693, p. 295 (misprinted 296). As far as I can discover, none of his editors has ever seen, or even been

¹ *Lismore Papers*, iv, 157.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 96.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 111.

² *Ibid.*, v, 78.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 195.

³ *Ibid.*, 89.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 198.

aware of the existence of the form in which they were first published, which, besides exhibiting some curious and interesting differences, adds a half-dozen lines which may or may not have been afterwards rejected by the poet. They made their first appearance, headed *To the Dutchess of Cleveland*, in "A New Collection Of Poems and Songs. Written by several Persons. Never Printed before. London: Printed by J. C. for William Crook, at the Green Dragon without Temple-Bar, 1674." 8vo, p. 71, and as this little book, although issued with at least three different title-pages, is not easily to be met with outside the great public libraries, the collation below may be of interest now and possibly of use hereafter.

1674.	1693.
l. 3 for	long
6 cast	thrown
9 Virtues	Vertue
10 When	While
17 Praise and Fame	Fame, and Praise
18 Smiles	Smile
29 you use but for your own defence,	you never use, but for Defence,
35 that	such

After l. 36 :

Well may I rest secure in your great Fate,
And dare my Stars to be unfortunate.

38 that	which
45 her	the
46 her	them
48 of	to
49 vast growing Debt of Poesie,	long growing Debt to Poetry,
50 You, Madam, justly	You justly (Madam)
52 Muse ; (<i>continuing</i>)	Muse.

Which, that the World as well as you may see,
Let these rude Verses your Acquittance be.
Receiv'd in full this present day and year,
One soveraign smile from Beauties general Heir.

G. T.-D.

A HUE AND CRY AFTER DISMAL

ON July 17, 1712, Swift wrote to Stella: "Pdfr has writ five or six Grub Street papers this last week. Have you seen Toland's Invitation to Dismal, or Hue and Cry after Dismal, or a Ballad on Dunkirk, or Argument that Dunkirk is not in our Hands? Poh! you have seen nothing." Advertisements of these and other papers were repeated in successive numbers of *The Examiner* from June 19-26 to the end of July 1712. *A Hue and Cry after Dismal* is advertised in numbers dated July 10-17, 17-24, and 24-31.

Copies of the first and third pieces mentioned in the *Journal to Stella*, in which the Earl of Nottingham is satirised under the nickname Dismal, are still to be met with; but even in the eighteenth century Nichols, Swift's editor, could find no trace of the other two. In June 1927, however, a copy of the long-lost folio broadside, *A Hue and Cry after Dismal*, was put up for sale at Sotheby's, purchased by Messrs. Quaritch for £190, by whom it was sold to Mr. Jerome Kern. It is now back in the hands of Messrs. Quaritch.

This copy was regarded as an only survivor. Nevertheless another copy of the broadside was preserved in the Bodleian, and even catalogued, Rawl. MS. D.383(135), though not under the name of Swift. And, further, there is another, and unrecorded edition, of this broadside in the Bodleian, Pamph. 305(53). The title differs in this edition, and six lines of verse are added to the prose, but otherwise, save for trifling verbal variants, the two broadsides are almost identical in text. The one title runs: *A Hue and cry after Dismal; Being a full and true Account, how a Whig L—d was taken at Dunkirk, in the Habit of a Chimney-sweeper, and carryed before General Hill*; the title of the other reads: *Dunkirk to be Let, Or, A Town Ready Furnish'd. With a Hue-and-Cry after Dismal: . . . General Hill. To which is added the Copy of a Paper that was found in his Pocket*. Both broadsides were printed in London in 1712;¹ but neither edition gives a printer's or bookseller's name. *Dunkirk to be Let* shows more typographical care than the other edition. A comparison of the slight variants is not helpful, but the version which adds the lines of verse is presumably the later of the two. They read:

¹ The imprint at the foot of the Bodleian copy of *Dunkirk to be Let* is badly frayed, but the place is evidently London, and the year 1712.

*Old Lewis thus the Terms of Peace to Burnish,
Has lately let out Dunkirk Ready Furnish'd ;
But whether 'tis by Lease, or Coppy-hold,
Or Tenure in Capite, we've not been told :
But this we hope, if yet he pulls his Horns in,
He'll be oblig'd to give his Tenants Warning.*

There seems no reason for the omission of these lines had they appeared in the earlier form of the broadside.¹ Are they by Swift? From their character they may well be. And, further, three or four slight improvements in phrasing, suggest that in this form the broadside, as a whole, has received touches of revision by the author himself. It is possible that Swift re-touched his paper for a second edition, and added the six lines, which, unless they are traceable elsewhere, may be regarded as a slight addition to his verse.

HAROLD WILLIAMS.

CORRESPONDENCE

SHAKESPEARE, JONSON, AND WILKINS AS BORROWERS AND SHAKESPEARE AND CHAPMAN AS TOPICAL DRAMATISTS

THE EDITOR, *Review of English Studies*

SIR,

I beg leave to comment upon Dr. G. B. Harrison's review of my two books, *Shakespeare, Jonson, and Wilkins as Borrowers*, and *Shakespeare and Chapman as Topical Dramatists*, which appeared in your issue of January 1930.

The fact that a case for borrowings and allusions, to be proved mainly by parallel passages, must necessarily rely much upon cumulative effect, is not modified by the further fact, that a hostile reviewer can select—in this instance, out of hundreds—two or three of the less convincing parallels; and thus, by removing them from their context, produce, deliberately, a false impression. I would remind Dr. Harrison of this; as also of a third fact, that a borrowing

¹ Further, Swift's reference and Morphew's advertisements in *The Examiner* leave little doubt that the broadside under the title *A Hue and Cry after Dismal* was the earlier form of the two.

from Tacitus, or any other classical writer, does not necessarily preclude a simultaneous contemporary allusion. I can adduce instances.

My critic states that I postulate, without evidence, a pre-Twelfth Night play. This assertion is untrue; my reasons being stated in chapter ii of my second book (pp. 14-29), which my opponent has read carelessly, or has not read.

When Dr. Harrison denies, by implication, that Alençon's courtship of Queen Elizabeth was still vitally interesting to playgoers when Shakespeare wrote *Twelfth Night*; and adds, "As vital presumably as the Diamond Jubilee to Mr. Noel Coward's audiences of 1927," he reveals, once more, complete failure, in my judgment, to understand the conditions of Shakespeare's age; since the question of a royal marriage—closely linked, as it must be, with that of succession to the Crown, as also with the anti-protestant intrigues, that continued deeply to trouble the country, right up to the Gunpowder Plot—necessarily continued to be of interest to the nation, almost to the day of Elizabeth's death. Events, moreover—and the popular mind with them—even in those "brisk and giddy-paced times," moved, relatively, with far less speed than in our highly mechanised age. In view of these indisputable facts, the analogy which Dr. Harrison draws, with Mr. Noel Coward and the Diamond Jubilee, becomes wholly false and irrelevant.

My critic quotes against me my own words, "Imagination, and a knowledge of the period, are as imperatively needed for the reviewing, as for the writing, of such books as these." By way of answer, I quote from Vernon Lee's Introduction to *The Handling of Words*, which happens to be lying on my desk:

The efficacy of writing depends not more on the Writer than on the Reader (itals. mine), without whose active response, whose output of experience, feeling, and *imagination* (itals. mine), the living phenomenon, the only reality, of Literary Art cannot take place.

It is because Dr. Harrison cannot, or will not, bring that needful imaginative response to my books, or to their subject, that his repeated attacks—of which I believe this to be the third within a year—continue to be as shallow as they are obviously prejudiced.

Turning to "knowledge of the subject," when the professor informs his readers that so well-known an Elizabethan as Horatio de Vere is "Oxford's brother," when, "to be sure," he was in fact the Earl's cousin, I am tempted to set down, after "imagination,"

another item upon the list of faculties and qualifications which my distinguished opponent regards as superfluous to the equipment of those who are honestly seeking to fathom and elucidate the enigmas of our mysterious Elizabethan drama.

I am, Sir, faithfully yours,
PERCY ALLEN.

[The above letter was shown to Dr. G. B. Harrison, who replies as follows :]

To Mr. Allen's complaints I will answer : (1) It is not unfair to select two or three examples of his parallels ; there are many more as far-fetched ; I could scarcely be expected to quote the whole book, of which the cumulative effect is not as Mr. Allen supposes. (2) I read his second chapter carefully, three times ; there is no *evidence* in it for a pre-Twelfth Night, though several *suggestions* that such a play *might* have existed. (3) Mr. Allen claims that the Alençon match was still vitally interesting about 1600 ; if so, this interest should be demonstrable from some outside source. Let Mr. Allen demonstrate it and his case will be worth considering. (4) The difficulty, which is insuperable, between Mr. Allen and some of his critics is that there is no common base for argument ; nor can there be so long as Mr. Allen continues to assume that his critics are fundamentally dishonest, and to give to such words as " truth," " evidence," " proof," " conclusive," more generous meanings than they should bear. May I add that when I wrote the review, in April 1929, I was not aware that Mr. Allen had joined the sect of those who believe that Edward de Vere, seventeenth Earl of Oxford, was the author of the works which scholars regard as written by William Shakespeare. Had I then known of his conversion I should have written differently, for I was under the misconception that when he spoke of Shakespeare he meant the gentleman of Stratford-upon-Avon.

G. B. HARRISON.

REVIEWS

The *Historia Regum Britanniae* of Geoffrey of Monmouth.

By ACTON GRISCOM, M.A. With a Literal Translation of the Welsh Manuscript, No. LXI, of Jesus College, Oxford, by ROBERT ELLIS JONES, S.T.D. Longmans, Green & Co. 1929. Pp. xii+672. 42s. net.

STUDENTS of Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia* have long lamented their dependence upon a text based almost entirely upon unidentified manuscripts chosen and set forth according to "the whim of a sixteenth-century printer." The first step to better things has now been taken by Mr. Griscom, who prints a transcript from one of the earliest manuscripts, the twelfth-century *Cambridge University Library MS. 1706* (li. i. 14), together with collations of *Bern Stadtbibliothek MS. 568*, NI, 8, which is of much the same date, and of the thirteenth-century *Ormsby-Gore MS.* (formerly *Porkington MS. 17*) in the possession of Lord Harlech. We are still far from a critical edition. There are, according to Mr. Griscom's admirable bibliographical appendix, one hundred and ninety known manuscripts, of which forty-eight are of the twelfth century. But the way is now open to further collation, with a view both to establishing verbal accuracy and to determining whether there are any substantial variations which throw light upon the history of the text. Mr. Griscom, whose book has a very full equipment of learned introduction and facsimiles, has made a notable advance, and has earned the gratitude, in particular, of all Arthurian students. If gratitude must to some extent take the form of controversy, that is implicit in the nature of the problems which so ambiguous a document as the *Historia* inevitably raises.

Mr. Griscom tentatively dates (p. 573) both the Cambridge and the Bern manuscript as "c. 1136"; that is to say, within a year, at most, after the probable completion of the work. It must be very doubtful whether either can be quite so early as this. It is clear from

a comparison of omissions and other textual variants that both have already diverged by scribal transmission from the original. Moreover, both contain (p. 453) in apparently inexact forms the list of Arthurian *consules* which, if an earlier speculation of mine (*R.E.S.* i, 431) is not illusory, Geoffrey probably based upon the English earldoms extant at the death of Henry I and those added by Matilda. They included that of Oxford, created in 1142, and the subsequent one of Salisbury, which an Eynsham charter noted by H. E. Salter (*Cartulary*, i, 75) now makes it possible to say was created not later than 1147. The list seems to confirm the conjectures based upon inferences drawn from the notices of the *Historia* by Henry of Huntingdon and Alfred of Beverley that Geoffrey may have altered his work some ten years or so after it was issued. And if so, the Cambridge and Bern manuscripts, which have the list, must be later than the alteration. Whether there is any manuscript which is without it, and may represent the original issue, is one of the things that further collation must show. Mr. Griscom does not, I think, discuss the point. His own use of the term "edition," in relation to Geoffrey's work, is a little puzzling. When he speaks (p. 42) of four editions he is thinking primarily, not of textual revisions in the body of the work, but of variations in the dedicatory formulae. Nearly all the manuscripts have the same dedication, to Robert of Gloucester; one, the *Bern MS.*, has a joint dedication to Robert and King Stephen; seven, a joint dedication to Robert and Waleran of Mellent; while one, *Bibl. Nat. Lat. MS.* 6233, to which E. Faral (*Romania*, liii, 18) has recently called attention, seems from an accompanying alteration in the reference (vii, 1) to Alexander Bishop of Lincoln, to represent an issue shorn of dedication after the deaths of Robert in 1147 and Alexander in 1148. But the prefixing of a variant dedication to a book obviously does not make it a new edition, unless there is also revision of the text. Nor, if there is more than one edition of the *Historia*, can it be assumed, in view of the scribal habit of conflating texts, that all manuscripts which have the same dedication represent the same edition. The dedication to the *Bern MS.*, in fact, is in a different hand from what follows, and may come from a different source. One example of deliberate alteration by Geoffrey, other than the hypothetical and not necessarily extensive revision of 1142-47, Mr. Griscom does show. The *Cambridge MS.* 1706 and one other manuscript, the thirteenth-century *Bodl. MS.* Addl. A. 61, have a line of Latin verse, for which

in most or all other manuscripts an alternative of greater literary merit is substituted. This is not, for the reason given, evidence that the Robert-Waleran dedication, which both these manuscripts have, was the earliest written; and, indeed, the five other manuscripts so dedicated have the revised line. Nor is the absence of the usual colophon from the *Cambridge MS.* proof that the colophon itself was an afterthought. The outer leaves of manuscripts perish first, and the colophon may have gone from the exemplar which the Cambridge scribe copied. Mr. Griscom re-argues the question as to priority among the various dedications at great length, and with much historical learning on the career of Waleran of Mellent. He shows, I think, that Waleran's support of Matilda's cause from 1141 onwards was hardly vigorous enough to justify the description of him as "altera regni nostri columpna," and on this ground prefers March 1136 for the reference to him. So far as that goes, the phrase may represent rather what Matilda's party hoped for in 1141 than what they actually got. But, whether it was written in 1141 or 1136, Mr. Griscom does not convince me that it had not been preceded by the single dedication to Robert of Gloucester in December 1135, when alone, so far as I can see, Geoffrey could have called Robert, then under pressure to assume the crown, "alterum Henricum," in disregard of the claims of Henry of Anjou. That the *Historia* was originally addressed to a single Earl is a clear inference from the "consule auguste" in the body of the text (xi, 1), which Mr. Griscom finds (p. 95) in all the manuscripts examined on the point, whatever dedications they incorporate. I do not know why Mr. Griscom suggests (p. 92) that the term "consul" is inappropriate to Robert. As used by Geoffrey, it means nothing but "Earl," and it is indeed the formal description of Robert in charters given by him. Mr. Griscom suggests that it was first applied to Waleran because he was campaigning in Normandy. He seems to be confusing it with "proconsul."

Much of Mr. Griscom's introduction is occupied with the relation of the *Historia* to the group of Welsh chronicles known as the *Bruts*, and in illustration he prints under Geoffrey's text a translation by Canon Jones of one of these. It is the version generally known as the *Tysilio*, here given from *Jesus College MS.* lxi, variously dated a little before and a little after 1500. It is only one of many. Mr. Griscom gives a list of fifty-eight manuscripts, ranging from the thirteenth to the eighteenth century. About a dozen may be

earlier than the sixteenth. "They differ from each other—slightly in subject-matter, radically in diction and phraseology." Mr. Griscom takes a *Dingestow Court MS.* of c. 1210-20 to be one of the earliest and to represent the earliest version, but to be itself only a copy. It is his object to support the claim of Professor Petrie in 1917 that those versions require much further examination than they have yet received, before a final conclusion as to the reality and probable nature of Geoffrey's alleged "*liber vetustissimus*" is reached. That is undeniable. In the meantime, I do not feel very clear as to what tentative conclusions Mr. Griscom has reached from the considerable attention which he has evidently paid to the Welsh versions. He does not (pp. viii, 104) think that any known to him "represents exactly, or perhaps even closely, the *vetustissimus liber* itself," and suggests (p. 98) that Geoffrey himself may have "sponsored" a translation into Welsh of the *Historia*, which "overlaid and superseded" the native *liber*. On the other hand, he thinks (p. 113) that even the *Tysilio* contains "native names and statements" not appearing in Geoffrey or in any other Latin history, and (p. 101) that "comparison of the *Historia* with certain of the existing Welsh Chronicles brings out very clearly in certain places just how much Geoffrey did expand, and enables us frequently to eliminate rhetorical flourishes, and to distinguish the original chronicle record." If Mr. Griscom is right here, we must "in certain places" be getting very near the *liber*. And in the end (p. 216) he "cannot escape the conviction that when scholars return to these primary sources, early British history will be found by them to have survived in legendary or story form, and that it can be recovered by diligent search and investigation. King Arthur and his wars, pre-Roman British kings, the movements and civilisations of ancient peoples and races, lie just the further side of these old stories and the dusty manuscripts that recount them." This, if it means anything, means not merely that there was a *liber*, but that we can strip Geoffrey's accretions off it, and that it was veridical, or at least as veridical as, say, Livy. Perhaps it will be better to wait as regards these wide inferences until the unpublished Welsh Chronicles have given up their secrets, and in the meantime to confine ourselves to the *Tysilio*. This at least we have now available, thanks to Mr. Griscom and Canon Jones, for comparison with the *Historia*. One would rather have had an earlier text, such as the *Dingestow Court MS.* of which Mr. Griscom speaks. His choice was determined, however, by the fact that reliance upon

an earlier translation of the *Tysilio* has vitiated the arguments alike of Professor Petrie and of his critics. Let those be left out of account. Even so, it remains impossible for any one, accustomed to compare related versions of a common narrative, to regard the *Tysilio* as in substance anything but a derivative from the *Historia*. It is the same narrative with the same succession of reigns, the same attribution of incidents to each reign, the same elaborate treatment, first of the Roman invasion, and later of Arthur and the house of Constantine. The colophon of *Tysilio* itself declares that it was turned from the Latin. It is not a literal translation. The story is more briefly told. Many of Geoffrey's details are absent; so are his rare personal references, his citations of classical writers, and many of what Mr. Griscom calls his "rhetorical flourishes." But the general correspondence between the versions is so close, that one version must be an expansion or the other an abridgement. Mr. Griscom appears to hint at an expansion. But that cannot be. After all, much of the rhetoric remains in the *Tysilio*, and echoes that of the *Historia*. The relation is by no means that of a "chronicle record" to a literary presentment based upon it. Moreover, the errors of the *Tysilio* confess its origin. The writer did not understand Geoffrey's *piratarum*, and turned them (pp. 237, 240) into "a tribe called the Pirattas" and "the piranaid, which were a cruel tribe." He makes nonsense (p. 291) of a passage about Caerleon, by omitting Geoffrey's statement that the Romans there were legionaries. He has Corineus. The etymologising Geoffrey, not a British annalist, found that name in Virgil. He has the notes of twelfth-century origin; the twelve peers of France from the *chansons de geste*, the twelfth-century Cologne legend of St. Ursula, the *amor courtois* at Arthur's court. It is true that there are glosses as well as omissions. These are, I suppose, the "native names and statements" to which Mr. Griscom refers. There are easy geographical glosses. There are genealogical glosses, additions of patronymics and the like, from the pedigree lore in which the Welsh abounded. There is a reference to Maelgwn looking on the yellow spectre. But these are names and statements which could be inserted from general knowledge, and certainly do not imply the use of a systematic "chronicle record" distinct from or underlying Geoffrey. In one or two places the *Tysilio* corrects an error in the *Historia* as we have it; notably the statement (p. 533) that Merlin prophesied not to Vortigern but to Arthur. Any careful reader might do this. But it is also possible

that the adapter had, as Wace appears to have had, a manuscript differing from those so far known to us. And from this, or from an independent source, but hardly of a "chronicle" type, he may have taken occasional major passages not in the *Historia*; a story (p. 301) of Llydd and Llyfelys, found elsewhere in Welsh; a couple of legends (p. 508) of St. Augustine; a story (p. 505) of sparrows at the siege of Cirencester, which Wace has, but which in any case comes from French romance, and not from Welsh chronicle. On the other hand, he omits the prophecies of Merlin, as well as the story (p. 469) of Helena and the giant, which did not interest Wales. Another omission (p. 365), which leaves the coming of the Saxons obscure, suggests the use of a mutilated manuscript. The reign of Vortipore may have been left out (p. 503) by accident.

As to Mr. Griscom's notion that there is veritable history underlying the early part of the narrative, whether it is Geoffrey's or that of his *liber*, I need not say much. He claims "archæological" support, which comes to very little. Certainly he will not be well-advised to rely on the "archæology" of some of the books which he cites. It is true that Professor Fleure, after studying the early trade-drifts and possibly population-drifts from the Mediterranean to these islands, ventured a similar speculation. I do not question the drifts, but they can have nothing to do with the legend of Brutus and the Trojans, which was shown long ago to derive from sixth- and seventh-century Frankish pseudo-history of a similar type. An inscription naming a son of Vortigern has been found in Ireland. But nobody supposes that Geoffrey invented Vortigern, and the son is not the same whom Geoffrey takes to Ireland, for the literary purpose of allying him with the king from whom Merlin stole Stonehenge. Geoffrey has a story of a British victory over a Roman legion under one Livius Gallus, and of the throwing of the heads of decapitated legionaries into the Walbrook, and Mr. Griscom points with triumph to the discovery of many skulls, apparently decapitated, in the bed of that stream. The Walbrook was an open stream in the Middle Ages, and Geoffrey may quite well have known of skulls there. But Mr. Griscom cannot seriously think, as Geoffrey, followed by his Welsh adapters, pretended to do, that the name Walbrook is derived from that of Livius Gallus.

E. K. CHAMBERS.

The Mabinogion. A new translation by T. P. ELLIS, M.A., and JOHN LLOYD, M.A. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1929. Pp. xii+232, ii+253. 10s. net, two vols. (India Paper ed. in one vol. 12s. 6d. net).

Two standard translations of the *Mabinogion* have already appeared, one into English by Lady Charlotte Guest and the Rev. John Jones (Tegid), and the other into French by Professor Joseph Loth. Neither of these is perfect, but they are adequate to the needs of the general reader, and even the scholar may use them with safety and profit unless he wishes to go minutely into details. Professor Loth's notes are particularly valuable to the student, and, as far as they go, may be used with confidence. It cannot be too emphatically asserted that the pitfalls which beset the path of the researcher into Arthurian Romance are by no means found in the mere understanding of the surface meaning of the text; in fact, the *Mabinogion* (with the exception of *Culhwch*) are probably the easiest and clearest of all the mediæval texts of Europe. The difficulty arises when the scholar tries to discover what original legends underlie the present complex of tales contained in these texts, or when he wishes to correlate the *Mabinogion* with other forms of legend. In their present form, as far as it concerns the scholar, the *Mabinogion* are a crude material which must be carefully worked over and manipulated before it can be utilised for comparison with other material. It was the absence of this preliminary study that vitiated much of the work of that brilliant scholar the late Sir John Rhys, who, on other grounds, had all the necessary qualities for such work, namely, a knowledge of Welsh and Irish, and of the mediæval and later legends of Europe in general. It follows, then, that the translator, unless he has the necessary knowledge, should not attempt to add either introduction or notes except on the formal details of the text.

The present translators have supplied short introductions and notes to their translation. Unfortunately, neither of them, except on one point, had the knowledge necessary to their undertaking. The translation itself, while leaving uncorrected the mistakes of their predecessors, contains in addition innumerable "howlers" of its own. The notes do contain what appears to be a distinct contribution to one aspect of the study, namely, the elucidation of the legal phraseology, for which Mr. Ellis, who has already published a work

on Mediæval Welsh Law, is presumably responsible. The quality of the notes will be apparent to any Arthurian student in the following example of a comment on p. 24: "The magic bag"—so runs the note—"or receptacle, is a common feature of Welsh story. By a fascinating process of development, which deserves a special monograph, the magic bag grew into the myth of the Holy Grail"!!

The Introductions are, frankly, worthless. The editors seem to be quite unaware of all the vast researches of the last fifty years into Celtic legend. Both Introduction and Notes (with the exception of the legal matter mentioned above) seem to be a not very intelligent reproduction of lecture notes given years ago at one of the Welsh Colleges, and to contain matter which every teacher has long ago discarded. It is impossible in the space at our disposal to mention any of the innumerable blunders of this unfortunate work, but the reader may be referred to Professor Ifor Williams's article in the *Welsh Outlook* for July 1929.

W. J. GRUFFYDD.

Aeneæ Silvii De curialium miseriis epistola. Edited, with introduction and notes, by WILFRED P. MUSTARD, Ph.D., D.Litt., Professor of Latin in the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore. The Johns Hopkins Press. London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1928. Pp. 102. 7s. net.

THIS is a welcome addition to the renaissance Latin texts edited by Dr. Mustard, and of special interest to students of English literature as a source from which Alexander Barclay drew freely in his Eclogues. A short introduction is followed by a carefully printed text formed on a comparison of early prints. The concise notes chiefly record Silvius's debts, to Juvenal in especial. We miss information about persons, e.g. Johann von Eich, to whom the epistle is addressed, and "Bernardinus prædicator," in cap. 3. In the notes on cap. 10, "regina Ioanna" is identified as Ioanna I of Naples, and the "magnus regni Appuliæ Senescallus," apparently, as her first husband, Andrew of Hungary; but the context seems to point to the Senescallus being Pandolfo Alopo, lover and chamberlain to Ioanna II. In cap. 39, Silvius attributes the statement "principes neminem nisi inconsulto quodam impetu diligunt" to Isocrates, "de regno." Dr. Mustard observes that "the precise reference is hard to find."

But may it not be to Isocrates 2, 20 (29), where the writer, warning the tyrant Nicocles against the faults of autocracy, advises him to choose his intimates with care: *Μηδεμίαν συνουσίαν εἰκὴ προσδέχου μηδ' ἀλογίστως*?

The adverbs *εἰκὴ* and *ἀλογίστως* correspond very well to "inconsulto quodam impetu."

The appendices contain some extracts from Silvius's letters and verses, and passages from Barclay's *Egloges, of the Miseries of Courtiers*.

The following references might be added: Cap. 3, "sibi et musis," see Jerome, Ep. 50, 2. C. 8 "audio quod obiciis," see Juv. 6, l. 546. C. 12, "Divitibus," etc., see Martial, 5, 81. C. 13, "non impletur auarus pecunia," see Vulg., Eccl. 5, 9. C. 21, "truncis affixa," see Juv. 10, 133. C. 44, "hiscere," see Juv. 5, 127; and, as a later parallel to C. 19, "alii modico pane uel caseo praegustato orificium stomachi clausurunt," Bobadill's "Pipe of tobacco to close the orifice of the stomach."

E. BENSLEY.

The Prologues and Epilogues of William Caxton. Edited, with a biographical introduction, by W. J. B. CROTCH, M.A. London: Published for the Early English Text Society by Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1928. clxiii + 115. 15s. net.

THE Early English Text Society has made a most valuable addition to its series by collecting in this volume all the original writings of William Caxton, with the exception of his continuation of Higden's *Polycricon* from 1357 to 1460. The Society will soon have produced editions of all Caxton's most important publications, illustrating to the full his skill, industry and discernment as a translator and publisher; his reputation as an original writer, however, depends mainly upon the Prologues and Epilogues, in which he explains his reasons for presenting his books to the public, and comments freely upon his literary interests.

Mr. Crotch has taken splendid advantage of his opportunity by prefacing the collection with a new life of Caxton. This is a work of the greatest importance, based upon a first-hand study of all the available documentary sources, many of which are here published

for the first time. Mr. Crotch's bibliography of documents and printed books indicates the thoroughness with which he has worked. This biography is scholarly, but not pedantic. At each stage of Caxton's career, a vivid sketch of contemporary events both in England and in Flanders is given; but every statement or conjecture about his life as merchant, diplomat, scholar, and printer is thoroughly examined, the relevant documents being transcribed in the Appendix. One of the most interesting of Mr. Crotch's discoveries is a record of a present of wine to Caxton in the *Kwartiermeestersrekening* of Middelburg, indicating that he was still "meester van der Inghelshe nacie," or Governor of the Merchant Adventurers, in 1470, and that he did not relinquish the office in 1469, as has been generally supposed.

Mr. Crotch deals fairly convincingly with the vexed question of Caxton's visit to Cologne in 1471. It was here that he fulfilled the "dreadful command" of his new mistress, the Duchess of Burgundy, by completing the translation of the *Recueil des histoires de Troie*; the *Recuyell*, the first book printed in the English language, was issued from the Caxton-Mansion Press at Bruges in 1475. Although Caxton almost certainly learnt to print in Cologne and may even have assisted an anonymous printer in producing the *De proprietatibus rerum* of Bartholomæus Anglicus, to which Wynkyn de Worde refers as printed by Caxton "at Coleyn," there is no evidence that he was sent there in order to learn the new art. Mr. Crotch suggests as his objective either a diplomatic mission or a voluntary exile, consequent upon the recent revolt of his native county of Kent. It is difficult to see why this event should have had any effect upon a loyal subject like Caxton, who had lived away from Kent for many years; but the fact that he took out a General Pardon in 1472 certainly lends probability to the conjecture that he may have found himself in some political dilemma, to which the clue has not yet been discovered.

Mr. Crotch gives a line-for-line reprint of the Prologues and Epilogues. Where French originals of the Prologues are extant, they are printed alongside. A marginal summary, as in the Appendix of Documents, might well have been added to guide the reader to the passages of special autobiographical interest.

It is a fine figure that stands revealed in this book; the most impressive personality of all the pioneer printers of Europe. Caxton shows in his original writings the quiet strength, the modesty, the

insistence on the highest standard, that always characterise a great man. When a gentleman informed him that his edition of the *Canterbury Tales* was imperfect and corrupt, he immediately produced a second edition from a perfect copy; he listened with good humour to complaints that his style was too "playn" or too "curious," pointing out the difficulty of adopting a standard of writing when the speech of different counties varied so much that "egges" in Kent were called "cyren."¹ Elsewhere he praises "this noble man Gefferey Chaucer";² John Skelton the poet ("I suppose he hath drunken of Elycons well"³); John Tiptoft, Earl of Worcester, the "Butcher of England," but nevertheless a great patron of learning;⁴ and all the valiant knights of former days.⁵ A study of this admirable book leaves the reader with the clear impression that the guiding principles of Caxton's life and writings were the pursuit of excellence in his own career, and the generous recognition of it in others.

ALFRED T. P. BYLES.

The Organization and Personnel of the Shakespearean Company. By T. W. BALDWIN. Princeton University Press and Oxford University Press. 1927. Pp. xii + 463. 27s. net.

To librarians and others who have to make a little money go a long way, and who view the growth of Shakesperiana with concern, Professor Baldwin's book may be commended as a work of major importance. It exhibits constructive skill in the assembling of scattered material and in the building up of a coherent argument; and it is well written. The title indicates very fairly the scope of the work; and the question at once arises whether the material exists from which to reconstruct and exhibit the actual organisation and personnel of the company for which and in which Shakespeare wrote all his plays. Is it possible from the material gathered by W. W. Greg, Tucker Murray, C. W. Wallace, E. K. Chambers,

¹ Prologue to *Eneydos*.

² Prologue to *Book of Fame*.

³ Prologue to *Eneydos*.

⁴ Epilogue to *The Declamacion of Noblesse*.

⁵ Epilogue to *The Ordre of Chyualry*.

and others to show exactly what this organisation was, who were members, where they lived, and even what parts they acted? Professor Baldwin was led to attempt his task by the wish ultimately to write on the "evolution of William Shakespeare," just as thirty years ago Sir Edmund Chambers, proposing to write a little book on Shakespeare, began his task of preparing the prolegomena by publishing the *Medieval Stage*. Professor Baldwin's preparatory work covers a much more limited field than Sir Edmund Chambers', but it has the advantage of being an entire field. It surveys the history of the Shakesperian theatre from 1576 to the closing of the theatres, whereas the *Elizabethan Stage* does not carry us beyond the death of Shakespeare. Professor Baldwin's argument finds its best supports from the history of the last thirty years of the company. The fact that it is a book of bold assumptions and hypotheses cannot seriously detract from its value, if the reader recognises that it is precisely in this effort to give coherence to evidences hitherto uncoordinated that the book is a challenge. Professor Baldwin has so marshalled his facts as to compel us to say whether or not his deductions from them are as obvious as he finds them. He assumes, for example, that the theatrical profession was bound by the apprenticeship enactments of 5 Eliz., and that actors became masters of their craft like mercers or ironmongers, only after serving an apprenticeship of at least seven years. To this one might reply that it was the Mercers' Company and the Ironmongers' Company that controlled and registered their apprentices. Is there any good evidence that the Elizabethan actors were similarly bound together as a craft or mystery? The Act of 5 Eliz. was an attempt to extend to the country as a whole the mediæval practices of London and the greater towns. The administration of the Act was left as before to local organisations of old standing. A law-suit cited by Sir Edmund Chambers (*Eliz. Stage*, vol. ii, p. 81) describes how one of the King's players undertook to train a pupil with a view to his admission amongst the King's men. Here there is certainly no suggestion of a bond of service for seven years. Nevertheless the assumption that an apprenticeship system existed appears to be justified by some of the examples Professor Baldwin cites. The question has importance since it suggests the inference that Shakespeare himself served some kind of apprenticeship of at least seven years.

Professor Baldwin's first chapter deals under the head "Laws and Customs" with the position generally of the theatre and its

ways and means during the Shakesperian period. Its main object is to demonstrate that "a London company of men was no haphazard aggregation of actors, but an established business organisation, working under definitely established laws and in accordance with well-defined customs." In the second chapter dealing with the membership of Shakespeare's company, from 1588 to 1603 he traces the actual membership with "practical certainty"; from 1603 to 1635 with almost absolute certainty, whilst the last seven years though less certain are fairly well covered. It is by beginning, therefore, in 1603 and working forward through the well-documented years to 1635 that Professor Baldwin prepares the ground for his investigation of the important years 1588 to 1603. It is interesting to be brought so close to Shakespeare as to be told that he remained one of the twelve patented members of his company up to his death, and that he was succeeded by Nathan Field. The earlier years are approached skilfully. Assuming that the list of twenty-six actors named in the first folio as "the principal actors in all these plays" is an authoritative and significant list, Professor Baldwin argues that it is a complete list of all the patented members from the time that Shakespeare began writing for the company. He argues, further, that it carries us back to 1588 and that the Shakesperian company is the continuation of Leicester's. His main points here are that the number of members was definitely fixed by patent, and that no member was admitted except to a vacancy. The peculiar traditions of the company he believes to have been already established in the Leicester companies. The third chapter traces the history of the housekeepers in the Shakesperian company. The housekeeping class consisted of the shareholders in the theatre and its properties. They were a body of co-operative proprietors. Not every patented member was a housekeeper, any more than every apprentice became a member at the end of his time. Clearly, however, the company consisted of more than patented members and apprentices. A third category, the hired men, are considered in the fourth chapter. These are described in an official document of 1624 as "musicians and other necessary attendants," and their names are given. Amongst them was the book-keeper of the company, who was also the prompter; and Professor Baldwin is able to show that in the earlier years of the company, probably as early as 1592, this book-keeper and prompter was one Thomas Vincent. There is good reading in this chapter on the duties of this official, and Professor

Baldwin makes the interesting suggestion that hand C in the *Boke of Sir Thomas More* is the book-keeper's. It is in this hand, for instance, that the actor's name, T. Goodall, is added and that most of the corrections are made. The technical use of the word "boke" to describe the play of *Sir Thomas More* or the play of *John a Kent* associates them with the official who looked after the copies and was accordingly called the book-keeper. Actors still use the technical term "book" in reference to a play. Professor Baldwin relieves the closeness of his argument on the functions of this official by an allusion to the trials and tribulations of Peter Quince. It is to the book-keeper that we owe the numerous occurrences in old printed plays of the names of minor actors. The eight plays in the First Folio which contain such insertions must therefore derive from the official licensed book. That the *Winter's Tale* was likewise so printed may be indicated by the fact that Herbert took Hemming's word for it in August 1623, that nothing profane had been added since it was first allowed, though the allowed book was missing. It was probably at the printer's. Professor Baldwin is on the side of the angels in believing that a minute study of all corrections on the surviving manuscripts of the company would bring us nearer to a knowledge of the state in which Shakespeare's manuscripts went to the printer. "If Shakespeare's official manuscripts suffered no more at the hands of correctors, including the author himself, than most of the surviving manuscripts of others, his editors are reasonably correct in saying that they 'scarce received from him a blot in his papers.'" Another interesting character among the hired men was the gatherer or door-keeper. Of these the company may have employed as many as twenty, some at least of whom were women.

The fifth chapter entitled the "Shakesperian Clan" shows how the actors clustered in community fashion round certain London centres, with their apprentices. Shoreditch and Southwark were such centres, but Hemmings' attachment to Aldermanbury was rather personal than professional. Shakespeare, who lived rather in rooms than at home in London, was connected with all three centres. This chapter with its references to the players' wills and other records shows how closely members of Shakespeare's company held together. They were a professional fellowship. "From youth they were educated for it, and in death their last thoughts were of it."

The sixth chapter deals with the finance of the company, and

therein of Shakespeare's income. Professor Baldwin finds ground for believing that before 1594 Shakespeare was making £25 a year, up to 1599 about £50 a year, up to 1608 £110 a year, and that his income rose to £155. He probably never received in any year more than £250. Assuming the modulus to be 8, this would give Shakespeare in his best year an income of £2,000 in post-war values.

The seventh chapter deals with division of labour in the company, the basis of the investigation being the five plays (post-Shakesperian), including the *Duchess of Malfi*, which gives the caste with parts assigned. From these are deduced the characteristics of the actors and the parts for which they were fitted. Thus "we have fair evidence that Lowin was the original Iago" as he was certainly Bosola, and almost certainly Volpone, Mammon, and Morose. Whether Professor Baldwin is justified in re-creating Lowin from the types he played is questionable. It is dangerous to transfer descriptive lines from the plays to the actor, but Professor Baldwin argues that each actor had a definite line and that each play was written up to and around these "lines." The plays were fitted to the company, not the company to the play. He therefore in the following chapter attempts to cast the Beaumont and Fletcher plays from the lists given in the second folio. In this way, he works the lines of the actors back to 1610, and since in the earlier plays the actors were the men who had performed for many years in Shakespeare's plays, he attempts in his ninth chapter, without the aid of guiding lists, to assign to definite actors their parts. It is an ingenious chapter. Professor Baldwin at least aims at showing that the problem is not as hopeless as it might at first seem. He is of course depending on his own judgment in breaking up the plays into "lines," as he calls them, and then assigning the "lines," as it were inevitably, to this or that actor, for whom the part presumably was written. Does he make sufficient allowance for versatility in the Elizabethan actor, and is he not carrying us rather far when he states that his "dissection has made it apparent that Shakespeare cut his play to fit his actors, even in the details of age and physical appearance, fashioning for each principal actor a suitable principal part"? One general conclusion at least is obvious, that Professor Baldwin has shown Shakespeare and his fellows in a closer association than we have been apt to recognise. His last chapter, therefore, he calls facing the facts. He claims that Shakespeare passed through every rank in

his company, including perhaps, formal apprenticeship ; and that no sound account can be given of the rise, development, and achievements of Shakespeare which does not relate him to his professional environment.

A. W. REED.

Donne the Craftsman. An Essay upon the Structure of the *Songs and Sonets*. By PIERRE LEGOUIS, Docteur ès-Lettres Chargé de Cours a la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Besançon. Paris: Henri Didier. London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1928. Pp. 100. 3s. net.

It is no light task to earn the Doctorate of the University of Paris. In addition to his exhaustive and penetrating study of Andrew Marvell, M. Legouis has had to present as a *parergon* this brilliant little essay on John Donne as a lyrical artist. Very justly M. Legouis maintains that, of late years, perhaps excessive stress has been laid upon the emotional side of Donne's work. It was a natural reaction from the earlier tendency to consider his work as the extreme example of witty virtuosity. What we need now is to recognise that he was indeed a great virtuoso, though we should not lay stress so entirely as earlier critics on the ingenuity and erudition displayed in his conceits. "The transmutation of both personal experience and recondite learning into lyrical poetry has not been paid its due share of attention. Art has not infrequently been denied in order to enhance the value of its time-honoured antithesis, nature." So M. Legouis. One might, I think, plead that the first essential step to a just appreciation of Donne's art was to clear it of the charge of mere ingenuity. M. Legouis' appreciation is the next step.

This estimate of Donne's art begins thus, not with his conceits, but his versification ; and in the first place with the variety and the originality displayed in his stanza structure. We are here given a table of the different kinds of stanza which Donne has employed or invented from couplets up to stanzas of no fewer than fourteen lines, in *Aire and Angells* and *Love's Growth*. "No stanza form is found in more than three pieces, and forty-four of them are found only in one piece each." M. Legouis might, had space allowed, have considered Donne's influence in stanza form on his religious followers, Herbert and Vaughan. Of modern poets I am inclined

to think the poet who would approach him most nearly in this respect is Shelley, whose varied forms, if not so numerous, are, I think, more uniformly felicitous, though it is difficult to compare justly poets aiming at so entirely different kinds of effect. In the case of both poets the variety is secured not only by the number of the lines but by the various types of line represented within each stanza and by the differences of the rhyme schemes. Donne introduces every type of line from one of two syllables up to one of fourteen. In the arrangement of his rhymes Donne is not, M. Legouis thinks, so fortunate as in his varying of the line length. He has not interwoven these so skilfully as Spenser and Shelley. "He does not stick at stanzas consisting merely of couplets and triplets following one another." "Donne's stanzas . . . nearly always lack internal concatenation or rhyme-linking." It seems to me that this defect is in Donne's poems not acutely felt because of their peculiar character, to which the length of the stanza and the varying length of the lines directly contribute, namely, the impression they convey of a passionate argument developed throughout the verse and the poem, the closely knit effect, the thought variously drawn out from line to line, which Milton secured in his way in both the sections of *Lycidas* and the paragraphs of *Paradise Lost*. An excellent example is that powerful poem the single-stanzaed *The Apparition*, which, as M. Legouis notes, has been kept out of English anthologies by moral rather than æsthetic considerations.

One effect of Donne's elaborate stanza-forms is noted—the contrast that one often feels between the free, passionate movement of the opening stanza and the more tormented, wire-drawn logic of those that follow, the effect on which Mr. Praz has dwelt in his valuable study.

The second quality of Donne's lyrical poetry on which M. Legouis lays stress is its dramatic quality, what the present writer had in view in describing it as "realistic," that is, a poetry which, like Browning's, gives one the impression, not of a poet singing sweetly of passion recollected in tranquillity, but of a lover and poet in the heat of the moment, and conveying to his reader the vivid impression of immediate experience, of the presence of the lady or another as well as of the poet. Legouis notes this in poems as *Breake of Daye*, the Valedictions, the *Sunne-Rising*, *The Canonization*, and not least in that interesting poem *The Ecstasie* on which M. Legouis has much to say. He thinks that Coleridge would not have commended the

poem so highly, nor I myself made it the central expression of Donne's philosophy, had we realised what it really was, namely, an *apologia* for seduction, a sophistical plea to his lady to surrender the fort. M. Legouis is mathematically logical, and it is, I suppose, vain to plead that one may develop as a paradox a thought which does contain the arguments which one would use seriously. However used on this occasion, Donne does here present the thesis of the interdependence of body and soul by which he would justify that union of soul and sense, of passion and affection which is his final justification of love, the union to which he has attained in the poems addressed to his wife. On another point M. Legouis has disagreed strongly with the present writer. Like Arondstein, he too thinks that my suggestion that certain of the poems were addressed to the Countess of Bedford and to Mrs. Herbert is outrageously absurd. It may be, yet I confess that I cannot rid myself of the suspicion. The next generation thought so, for Aubrey takes for granted that *The Primrose* was written at Montgomery Castle. Arondstein, I think, suggests that perhaps Donne was engaged in an amour with one of Mrs. Herbert's waiting women! My suggestion is, whether I am right or not with regard to Mrs. Herbert, that there are three strata in his love-poems: (1) those of his early days whose theme is seduction, the objects of which were the women, married or unmarried, of the citizen class; (2) a few poems addressed to his wife, poems of pure affection; and (3) poems that are in reality complimentary poems couched in the language of love and addressed to such patrons and friends as the Countess of Huntingdon, Lady Bedford, and perhaps Mrs. Herbert in the early days of their friendship. I may be in error as to individuals, but the classification is of importance for a right perspective in studying these strange poems. M. Legouis has written a brilliant little essay in admirable English.

H. J. C. GRIERSON.

André Marvell: poète, puritain, patriote, 1621-1678.
Par PIERRE LEGOUIS. Henri Didier, Paris; and Oxford
University Press. 1928. Pp. xii+514. 16s.

THIS biographical and literary study of Marvell is on a larger scale than has yet been accorded to him. M. Legouis, who dedicates the work to his father, the well-known professor at the Sorbonne, has

done a useful service complementary to that which Mr. Margoliouth has done by his critical edition of Marvell's poems and letters. The ample and careful bibliography completes the material which any student of Marvell can reasonably require. It is improbable that any further research will discover any facts of importance or impugn those which M. Legouis has seen reason to accept. No interpretation of Marvell as poet and thinker can be final, but M. Legouis has established his right to be heard in any future estimate of Marvell's place in English literature.

In considering Marvell's debt to other writers, M. Legouis disallows Beeching's suggestion that Milton was his "good angel," and regards his influence as negligible. Donne is his only master, and his influence is fully revealed in such a poem as *The Definition of Love*, which is metaphysical and an entirely justified example of "ce genre périlleux." But Donne's interest is in Man rather than in Nature, and Marvell, catching hints from the elder poet, develops for himself a metaphysical poetry of Nature, and as such is a precursor of Wordsworth, Shelley and Keats. The quality of Marvell's mysticism is well stated as having little religious character. This "out-of-doors metaphysician" can swoon in a sensuous ecstasy "in which God and woman have no part." He shows "une sensualité végétale" which may be paralleled in Keats' ode *To Autumn*. M. Legouis with a Gallic insistence exacts the full value of the masculine passion exhibited in *To his Coy Mistress*. It is, therefore, the more surprising that he should believe himself to discover Puritanism in the early pastoral poems. In *A Dialogue between Thyrsis and Dorinda* he professes to detect the Puritan note in the line "A Chast Soul, can never mis't" ("it" is "the Elizium"). In *Clorinda and Damon* he identifies Pan with Christ. This seems to be treating these light pastoral poems too heavily. It is, again, doubtful if Marvell "reveals himself a Puritan" in *On a Drop of Dew*, or if Calvinism is discoverable in *The Coronet*, one of the few distinctly religious of his poems, which most readers have found like enough to Herbert's.

M. Legouis does not attribute to Marvell, in spite of some happy instances, the kind of close observation of nature which Tennyson possessed. His peculiar merit is to set man in harmony with nature and open his mind, as well as his eyes, to her influence. He is the poet of grass, more than of flowers and trees, of meadows more than of gardens. M. Legouis claims that Marvell introduces the Mower

into English poetry, but Milton has been before him with his vivid line "The mower whets his sithe." M. Legouis finds Marvell like Donne short-winded; he complains that in his only long poem, *Appleton House*, Marvell is discursive and diffuse, lacking in sobriety and balance, and he contrasts the orderly development of thought in *L'Allegro* and *Il Penseroso*. He also charges Marvell with lack of application and with failure to make full use of his poetic gift; even in so small an output there is "a surprising amount of negligent improvisation." Yet, with all these deductions, M. Legouis supports his own very high view of Marvell's best poetry by a quotation from Professor Grierson's introduction to *Metaphysical Lyrics and Poems*. This high estimate is corroborated by the poems of the second period. After an interesting comparison with the poems on the Protector by Waller and Wither, M. Legouis justifies Sir Charles Firth's description of Marvell as "the poet of Cromwell and the Protectorate." He regrets that the average reader, while he has by heart the famous lines on Charles I on the scaffold, has seldom been as familiar with the rest of the Horatian Ode. As a political satirist, Marvell is judged by M. Legouis to be the most eminent during the first eighteen years of Charles II, although his work is patently inferior to what Dryden was soon to accomplish.

The chapters dealing with Marvell as M.P. for Hull and as the writer of political and theological polemics concern the student of literature less than the earlier chapters. M. Legouis allows that the controversy with Samuel Parker is tiresome, and that the general reader can best enjoy Marvell's hard blows against his adversary without troubling overmuch about the exact issues. When the editor essays to gather Marvell's religious convictions from this pamphleteering, he is driven to admit that some uncertainty must remain because debating points against Parker may not represent Marvell's inner mind. He had enough worldly prudence to avoid embarrassing himself with the open advocacy of opinions which would not have brought him credit in that age. M. Legouis finds in the writings of Marvell's favourite nephew, William Popple, links with the deists of the next age. Marvell would seem to have more in common with the latitudinarians, like John Hales whom he knew at Eton, than with the dogmatic Puritans, but it is difficult to reach any wholly satisfactory estimate of his personal convictions, either in politics or in religion.

In spite of there being two lists of Errata, many minor errors

have escaped detection. Fuller's college, if it must be described in French, should be "le collège des reines." George Herbert died not "one year only," but exactly two years after Donne. Edward Fairfax, the translator of Tasso, was tutor to his nephews in the generation above Marvell's Lord Fairfax. The Prayer-book of 1549 can hardly be described as "Elizabethan English." The "trebles" of the organ in *Musicks Empire* are not rightly translated as "trilles."

F. E. HUTCHINSON.

The Pilgrim's Progress. By JOHN BUNYAN. Edited by JAMES BLANTON WHAREY. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1928. 8°. Pp. cxiv+352. 21s.

"THE aim of the present edition is quite definite," says Mr. Wharey in his preface (p. xvi); "it is to write the history of the editions of the *Pilgrim's Progress* that were issued in England from 1678 to 1688, and to discover as far as may be possible their relative textual value." He might have added that his aim was also to produce a text of the *Pilgrim's Progress*. Both these aims he has achieved, the former the more satisfactorily. It is a necessary preliminary to the latter, involving more industry and less acumen. Mr. Wharey's industry has not been at fault. He describes in detail the first dozen editions of the book and the dozen existing copies of the first edition, and discusses their relationships. Neither of these tasks is easy, for the book was carelessly printed and underwent no systematic revision by the author, so that the variants can often only be explained as being due to the negligence or caprice of successive printers, and of the copies which have to be used as evidence several seem to be made up of sheets from more than one edition. Mr. Wharey gives the evidence in full, states the problems clearly, and arrives at a judicious conclusion about the relations of the editions to each other and the claims of each to be used as a basis for his text. He shows quite conclusively that the first, second, third, fourth and seventh editions form one group, the fifth to the eleventh (excepting the seventh) another, and that the former is immeasurably the more trustworthy of the two. This conclusion he reaches independently by study both of bibliographical points and of textual variants. The relations between the editions, as far as it is possible to discover

them, are well summarized on pp. lxxxvi-viii, and in the section on "What editions did Bunyan supervise?" Mr. Wharey states clearly his reasons for using the third edition for the basis of his text and explains (p. ci) his refusal to include the marginal additions of the fourth edition.

To reach these conclusions and to explain the process by which they were reached and the evidence on which they are founded must have been a long, dull, and difficult task, and Mr. Wharey is to be congratulated on his execution of it. The Clarendon Press is also to be congratulated on producing a book worthy of the series to which it belongs, and praise of the production of a volume can hardly be higher.

The text itself is not so satisfactory.

Mr. Wharey has in the main stuck to the third edition, and in the main he is right. But the reason which induced, or ought to have induced, him to do this, namely, the fact that the third edition most nearly represents Bunyan's intention, should have led him to admit a good many readings from the first, if not from the second, edition. For if an editor's aim is to reproduce the text intended by Bunyan he ought not to side with the third, where it differs from its predecessors, except where he believes the change to be due to Bunyan's care and not to the printer's carelessness. Comparison of Mr. Wharey's text with the British Museum copy of the first edition suggests that there is ground for complaint about his practice in this matter.

Mr. Wharey's rule is to mark with "angular" brackets in his text all variations from the text of the third edition and to record in his *apparatus criticus* "all significant variations from it" (p. cxi). If he were to be faithful at once to this rule and to his aim of using the third edition as a basis for getting at what Bunyan wrote, his text would be marked with angular brackets at every point where there has been any deterioration of the text in its transmission from the first to the third edition, and his *apparatus* full of the inferior readings given by the third edition at these points. The carelessness of the printers has already been remarked upon; and the unpleasant prospect of a forest of angular brackets seems to have led Mr. Wharey to sacrifice these possible improvements in his text, and (since it would have been both cumbrous and absurd, while keeping the worse reading in his text, to print the better in his *apparatus*) to conceal the truth by omitting the variants from his *apparatus*.

This would not be so grave an error if it were consistently practised, but as it is we are put off our guard by the fact that Mr. Wharey records very many trifling points where the first and second (and even the later) editions contain a reading which is worse or no better than that of the third. The reader need not look further than *The Author's Apology for his Book* (pp. 1-8) for examples, of which we will take the most venial first: (1) p. 3, 1.2: Fowler (third edition), *Fowler* (first and second editions). The roman letter may be right; if so, was the variant worth recording? Mr. Wharey evidently thinks so, for he records it. Why then does he omit exactly similar variants from the first edition (ital. for rom.) at lines 13, 29, 30 on the same page?

Here the matter for complaint is the omission of an inferior reading from the *apparatus criticus* (taken in conjunction with the inclusion of a precisely similar variant at another point); but it is not only inferior variants that are omitted; (2) p. 3, lines 19-20:

*They must be grop'd for, and be tickled too,
Or they will not be catcht what e're you do.*

The first edition (though Mr. Wharey's *apparatus* does not tell us so) has a comma after "catcht." Is this a better reading? Certainly it is no worse. Perhaps Mr. Wharey would say that there is nothing to choose between the two readings. If this is so, is it conceivable that Bunyan should have deleted the comma in revising the book—or that its omission is due to anything but the carelessness of the printer of the third (or it may be the second) edition? If this is so, is there any conceivable reason for perpetuating the result of his carelessness? Here the ground for complaint is the omission, even from the *apparatus*, of a variant no worse than that recorded in the text; but it is not only variants of equal value that are omitted. (3) Real and undoubted improvements which might have been introduced from the first edition do not appear even in Mr. Wharey's *apparatus criticus*, e.g. at p. 2, l. 24 and p. 4, l. 11, the third edition runs together two paragraphs divided by the first, but Mr. Wharey does not even tell us that the first divides them. Again, p. 2, lines 11-12:

*Some said, John, Print it; others said; not so:
Some said it might do good; others said, no.*

So the third edition and Mr. Wharey; the first edition reads:

*Some said, John, print it; others said, Not so:
Some said, It might do good; others said, No.*

Yet Mr. Wharey gives us no trace of this far better version, a version which in the second line actually changes the sense for the better, because, to incorporate it, he would have to write in his text <print> . . . <Not> . . . <It> . . . <No>, and include "Print" . . . "not" . . . "it" . . . "no" in his *apparatus*. Would it not have been better to renounce his minute fidelity to the third edition and silently adopt the reading of the first? Again, p. 3, lines 31 *sqq.*:

*If things that promise nothing, do contain
What better is than Gold? who would disdain
That have an inkling of it, there to look,
That they may find it?*

So the third edition and Mr. Wharey, who gives no indication that the first reads "Gold;" though he does think it worth while to mention that it encloses "That . . . it" in the next line in brackets.

A passage selected at random from the middle of the book contains similar examples, e.g. p. 118:

*The Meadows green; besides their fragrant smell
Yield dainties for them:*

So the third edition and Mr. Wharey, who does not tell us that the first edition reads:

*The Meadows green, besides their fragrant smell,
Yield dainties for them:*

though he does tell us that the seventh edition reads *daintaies*, the ninth *daieties* for *dainties*, and, two lines lower, the seventh, *Feild* for *Field*.

Lower on the same page we find the sentence "So the soul of the Pilgrims were much discouraged, because of the way," with the reference "Numb. 21. 4" in the margin. The *apparatus* reveals the fact that the fifth, sixth, eighth, and subsequent editions mended the grammar by reading "Souls," and that the first edition read "was" for "were." In Numbers XXI. 4 we read "the soul of the people was much discouraged by the way." Would not a prudent editor assume that Bunyan wrote "was" (as in the reference he gave), and that the compositor of the second edition, misled by the plural "Pilgrims," changed it to "were" and was followed by the third? And if this is so, what conceivable reason is there for keeping the ungrammatical "were"?

These examples suggest that Mr. Wharey is unduly inclined to omit the readings of the editions previous to the third and not to

adopt them even when he does record them. Indeed, one is tempted to suppose that they did not occur in the copy of the first edition that he used, and that they are peculiar to the British Museum copy.¹ If so, it is a pity that a copy containing such superior readings was not made use of, and a still greater pity that Mr. Wharey did not at least tell us that copies of the first edition vary, and which of them he used. He does in fact give a list of eight occasions where there are textual differences between the copies of the first edition which he has examined (pp. xxviii-ix), and he suggests that for these copies (and the B.M. copy is one of them) the list is exhaustive; actually the B.M. copy itself, on two of these occasions (p. 6, lines 25-27; p. 11, line 27) contains a reading different from that quoted by Mr. Wharey as common to the B.M., Pierpoint Morgan and Warner copies, and on one of the two its reading differs more markedly from their alleged common reading than that reading differs from that of the Lenox and Rylands copies—yet it is the latter difference that Mr. Wharey intends to illustrate.

It seems that Mr. Wharey, having decided that all editions subsequent to the seventh (or, indeed, subsequent to the fourth, except the seventh) have no textual authority, would have done better to omit their variants (which in any case are for the most part negligible) entirely from his *apparatus*, and to construct from the earlier editions the best possible text, using the third if he liked as his "basis," but freely repairing its deteriorations, even the minutest, from the earlier editions, and only recording such changes as really altered the meaning.

This would entail a radical change of plan; changes which could more easily, and should most certainly, be incorporated in a second edition, are the following: p. xxvii, line 3, for "No. 9" read "No. 8"; p. xxx, line 13, the "features" of the first edition recorded on this page are certainly not "peculiar" to the first edition, and it is most misleading so to describe them; p. lxxxiii, line 27, *χριστολογία* is wrongly spelt and lacks an accent; p. xcvi, line 15, the fifth is omitted from the list of editions belonging to the second group; if this omission is intentional it needs explanation; if not, it is particularly unfortunate; p. 13, line 4, presumably <company> should be <company>; as it is, the reading in the text is the same as that in

¹ In the very first textual note in the whole book, a note on the title of the prefatory verses, the reading of the B.M. copy of the first edition differs from that recorded as the reading of the first edition by Mr. Wharey.

the *apparatus* which it is intended to supplant; p. 13, lines 27-8, the reading of the Lenox and Rylands copies, recorded on p. xxviii, is far better than that printed in the text (which is retained simply because the second edition happened to be printed from another copy of the first edition, and the third from the second), yet it is not even recorded in the *apparatus*; p. 116, l. 29, "*Korah Dathan, and Abiram*": Mr. Wharey has failed to rectify the omission of a comma here, and concluded that Korah Dathan was a single person, and so he appears in the index, under K, on p. 348; if Mr. Wharey had looked up the reference quoted in the margin he might have been saved this error; p. 339, line 29, readers of this Review and others will recognise another fictitious character in "Mr. Donald B. McKerrow." Finally, there is an erratum in the *Errata*.

JOHN SPARROW.

Dryden und die romische Kirche. Dr. B. JOSEF WILD. (Inaugural-Dissertation.) Robert Noske in Borna-Leipzig. 1928. Pp. x+92.

AMID all the exploration of the Restoration period that is proceeding, Dryden remains, in spite of the massiveness of his personality and achievement, something of a riddle. His poems allow us to follow him from the Parliamentary side to the Royalist, from the Church of England to the Church of Rome, but, in a diary-keeping, letter-writing and memoir-compiling age, he left comparatively little intimate record from which to trace the hidden inner lines of his development. It is perhaps fair to say that most English accounts of Dryden have not concerned themselves very seriously with his changes of faith. His critical flexibility has interested us more than what Dr. Wild sees as the long quest for Authority in religion. Yet his most spontaneous poem, *Religio Laici*, was a statement (hardly a confession) of faith, and his longest and most elaborate poem, *The Hind and Panther*, was a defence of the religion which he had chosen for himself. If a re-study of the extant material dealing with Dryden's religious development can shed any new light on this latter poem, or enhance our appreciation of the mellowness which, in spite of poverty and detraction, the author of the *Fables* achieved, it is clearly the duty of all Dryden's serious readers to undertake it.

Dr. Josef Wild sets himself to the study of this material in the full conviction of the sincerity and political independence of Dryden's conversion to Roman Catholicism. It is a major part of his thesis that the conversion was the inevitable outcome of a long process, many signs of which are to be traced years before James II's accession. Thus *Religio Laici*, superficially an exposition of the views of an English Churchman, is considered in a section headed "Auf dem Wege nach Rom" (p. 53). By emphasising such passages as the famous opening lines on the "dimness" of Reason and the couplet :

Such an omiscient Church we wish indeed :
"Twere worth both Testaments, and cast in the Creed,

Dr. Wild argues that this poem already reveals a mind dubious of the reasonable, distracted by the clash of sects, harassed by the relativity of opinion and tradition—in a condition, in short, which has frequently been the prelude to conversion.

The case for Dryden's sincerity (if it needs buttressing) can be considered strengthened. The riddle, however, remains. We are offered no fresh ground of unity between Catholic apologist and critic. There was only one face of his religion (however many others there may have been) which Dryden showed to the world. We see him, here as elsewhere, logical, argumentative, controversial, with a use for wit and humour and all the satirist's weapons. He has left us no other way of approach to him except by his own, external, methods.

G. D. WILLCOCK.

Three Plays by Nicholas Rowe: Tamerlane, The Fair Penitent, Jane Shore. Edited by J. R. SUTHERLAND, with Introduction, Bibliography and Notes. . . . The Scholartis Press. 1929. Pp. viii+355. 15s. net.

EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY tragedies are surely among the mustiest of the denizens of old libraries. When such men as Mr. Sutherland venture to grapple with the creatures in the interest of pure scholarship, they deserve commendation merely for undertaking such a dreary task.

Nicholas Rowe is one of the earliest and best of a bad lot. He is a kind of weakened and watery Otway with a gift for the writing of fluent blank verse, which occasionally almost blunders into poetry.

His plays are a curious mixture of stagy artifice and unreal psychology with touches of genuine pathos and humanity. His place in dramatic and in general literary history, however, though small is really significant. He was a minor classic to the men of the eighteenth century, even to such a critic as Johnson, who praised him for "the reasonableness and propriety of his scenes," "the elegance of his diction and the suavity of his verse," and declared that "he always delights the ear, and often improves the understanding." There is little doubt that his plays are one of the chief sources of the great stream of eighteenth-century sentimentality, and that his *Lothario*, who like *Mrs. Grundy* has become part of the English language, was the ancestor of *Lovelace* and one of the remote progenitors of the Byronic hero-villain. So there is plenty of justification for a scholarly reprint of a selection from his works as an aid to the student of literary history, although, if they depended on their intrinsic merit, it is unlikely that any one would have disturbed their repose.

Mr. Sutherland gives us the text of three of the best plays, *Tamerlane*, *The Fair Penitent*, and *Jane Shore*, with an introduction containing a biography, a note on the state of the theatre, a brief essay on each play, a bibliography and a commentary. His text is based on the first quartos, with a collation of later editions. The old spelling is retained, but the punctuation is occasionally altered—rather unnecessarily in the opinion of the present reviewer—"for the sake of clearness." The lines of the plays unfortunately are not numbered, and reference to the notes, which are only distinguished by page numbers, is therefore not easy.

The introduction contains much useful information, but is inadequate as a critical estimate. Part of our interest in Rowe is due to the fact that his work seemed to Johnson remarkable for its elegance of diction and suavity of verse. A study of this diction and this verse with reference to the formation of the Augustan style in poetry ought surely to have formed part of the introduction to a modern edition. Mr. Sutherland's commentary is also meagre, and consists mainly of notes on stage history. The tracing of Rowe's numerous debts to Shakespeare and to Milton would have enhanced its value for the student. The proof-reading seems to have been done carefully, but "lost" is certainly a misprint for "last" on p. 175, while "Anne, Countess of Winchelsea" on p. 341 is a bad lapse which cannot be entirely due to the printer.

V. DE SOLA PINTO.

Alexander Pope as Critic and Humanist. By AUSTIN WARREN. Princeton Studies in English. Number I. Princeton University Press. London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1929. Pp. ix+289. 11s. 6d. net. Cloth 13s. 6d. net.

PROFESSOR WARREN tells us that it has not been his purpose "to make out that Pope was really a romanticist in disguise, and so to rescue him from the opprobrium of neo-classicism; but rather to assist in the rehabilitation of the maligned and misunderstood attitude." The assistance which he gives, being fully and carefully documented, does not depend upon its point of view for its value, and few students will care to disparage it. But are not these maligners and misunderstanders becoming very scarce? Mr. Warren quotes with approval, too, an allusion to the straw figures of "classicist" and "rationalist" to be found in popular books and essays. Are these books and essays any longer regarded as important? It seems time that some one told this champion of "the eighteenth century" that it is he who is fashionable. The straw "romantic," if he has not already arrived, will certainly be ready for the next batch of text-books. Happily we are not obliged to read them.

Mr. Warren might have admitted more frankly than he does, perhaps, not only that "the eighteenth century" is fashionable, but also that Pope's criticism is interesting largely because it adopted at the time no new standpoint. Its very unoriginality is, for us, a merit. He himself thinks (though he stakes a high claim for the Homeric criticism and draws attention to the somewhat neglected *Observations on the Iliad*) that the *Preface to Shakespeare* is, "all things considered, the best criticism Pope ever wrote." He would not, one imagines, dispute, though he does not emphasise, such a judgment as Professor Nichol Smith's, that it expresses the average well-informed contemporary opinion with great distinction of style.

Mr. Warren's own style, though never merely oppressive, is uncertain. Such sentences as these should not have escaped him: "One cannot hope to understand the literature . . . of the eighteenth century unless he is able . . . to assume its validity," "as regards the particular relation of Dryden's to Pope's criticism, the evidence for its being rather close is a good one," "Pope's chariot fell into the water with temporary injury, through the broken glass, to two of the poet's fingers."

A few small points are debatable: (1) Does "modern taste" assent, as Mr. Warren conjectures, to the judgment that Sackville is the "best English poet" between Chaucer and Spenser? (2) Can the critic who starred, Baedeker fashion, in his edition of Shakespeare *Take, oh take those lips away* and *Fear no more the heat o' the sun* be regarded as deficient, on this evidence, in his appreciation of lyric? His discrimination seems even more remarkable than his "almost total neglect of the wealth of lovely songs." (3) Is space profitably occupied by three separate references in the same volume to Professor Saintsbury: (a) "the usually generous," (b) "who is eager to discover good things everywhere," (c) "who can usually find some good in every poet"? A more retentive and a less acquiescent reader might have been imagined.

General Codrington, even before Mr. Harlow's monograph, need not have proved unidentifiable.

The vital part of Pope's criticism, separately issued, would make a useful volume of moderate compass. To have published the material embodied in this study in a drastically shortened form as introduction and notes to such a book would have involved (apart from a doctorate of philosophy) considerable sacrifice, whilst it might on the whole have increased its force.

M. G. LLOYD THOMAS.

John Gay's London. By WILLIAM HENRY IRVING. Harvard University Press. London: Humphrey Milford. 1928. Pp. xviii+459. 27s.

WHEN the sophisticated muse of the Augustans took London by storm with the revival of *The Beggar's Opera*, it initiated the series of studies, reprints, anthologies and editions which continue to appear. The eighteenth century is still the mode. Such a book as this of Mr. Irving's, armed on the title-page with the name of John Gay himself, supplies a background to eighteenth-century verse, of which the best and most characteristic was, as a rule, urban in inspiration. Let us say at once that all we can possibly want to know about John Gay's London is here, and that the author lavishly redeems his promise to "throw light on the way ordinary people lived in London

at that time." Every nook and cranny has been searched, every type described, every activity illustrated, and the citizens of London, from the beau to the beggar, their daily life, their amusements, and their vices are shown to us with photographic minuteness.

Nevertheless, at the risk of flat disagreement with the author, we must challenge his Envoi. Modesty is a pleasing quality, but we cannot help feeling that Mr. Irving is wrong when he attributes the chief if not the only value of his book to his "numerous and lengthy quotations." To speak truth, they are both too numerous and too lengthy. He has tried to combine a social history of his period with an anthology of verse dealing with his subject, and his bibliography contains roughly some 400 names! The result is that it is difficult to see the wood for the trees. Our attention and memory are fatigued by lists of names and titles, and extracts short and long. In 10 pages, taken almost at random, there are 36 quotations, many of them more than 14 lines long. As the book is not an anthology, we should have been quite willing to take the author's conclusions on trust and should have enjoyed more generalisation. The all too short passages in which he does gather up his impressions for us are written with vividness and gusto, and it is a pity he did not give us more in that style and sacrifice many of his extracts. The chief value, indeed, of these lies in giving to *Trivia* its true merit by comparison. Its sparkle and incisiveness stand out in contrast with other examples of the same kind of poem, and we realise afresh the effectiveness of a choice, rather than a wealth of detail, a lesson Mr. Irving might perhaps have learnt from Gay. The right balance between documentation and generalisation, such as is maintained in a book like Traill's *Social England* would have added immeasurably, not so much to the value of this study, as to its clarity and readableness.

It would also have been better if the time-limit of the title had been observed. It is not possible to give the literary history of three decades in a breathless chapter with the detail that Mr. Irving attempts, any more than it was necessary in another chapter to collect every contemporary reference to Gay himself. Throughout the book we have references to poets of previous centuries, to Dekker (1630), Turberville (1575), Hall (1597), and many more, quotations from Donne and Jonson, while the chapter on descriptions of London begins with Dunbar and Occleve and includes the whole of Wordsworth's sonnet on Westminster Bridge!

(Didn't Dunbar write, by the way, "Timor mortis conturbat me"? Mr. Irving has "*perturbat*.")

In conclusion, we cannot but admire Mr. Irving's industry, accuracy and obvious enjoyment of his subject, an enjoyment he succeeds in communicating to his readers. It is because we appreciate what he gives us of himself that we wish there had been more of it.

KATHLEEN CAMPBELL.

Johnsonian Gleanings, Part V, The Doctor's Life, 1728-1735. By ALEYN LYELL READE. Privately printed for the Author. London: Percy Lund, Humphries & Co. 1928. Pp. xii+314. 25s. net.

MR. A. L. READE's contribution to Johnsonian studies is impressive. So long ago as 1906 he published a large quarto, *The Reader of Blackwood Hill*, more than half of which consists of and is accurately described as "A full account of Dr. Johnson's ancestry, his kinsfolk and family connexions." To this solid volume he has proceeded to add at varying intervals parts of the series, initiated in 1909, modestly named *Johnsonian Gleanings*. The present part brings Johnson's life down to the end of his bachelor days and includes of course his career at Oxford; it is, in the present writer's opinion, the most valuable of the whole series. Almost at the outset Mr. Reade is faced by the problem which has vexed all the great editors of Boswell from Croker to Birkbeck Hill—the duration of Johnson's university career. Did this career last three years or thirteen months? Boswell says three years, and his reputation for accuracy is so great that his statements are usually accepted even when they are about matters of which his knowledge was imperfect. Croker, however, on the authority of Dr. Hall, the reigning Master of Pembroke, declared in favour of the shorter period; but because he failed to show or explain his "working," his solution has never gained general acceptance. Birkbeck Hill agreed in the main with Croker, but he was unable to explain certain charges entered in the buttery-books against Johnson's name after the expiration of the thirteen months' period in December 1729. Mr. Reade has now submitted the buttery-books to a new examination, than which

nothing could be more thorough or skilful ; the chief result of his scrutiny is that the occasional and isolated charges, hitherto regarded as proof of residence, prove in fact non-residence ; accordingly, it can now be stated with absolute certainty that Johnson " went down " some time during the week beginning December 12, 1729, after thirteen months' continuous residence, and never returned as an undergraduate.

Mr. Reade, thanks to Johnson's own " catalogue " of his undergraduate collection, also adds considerably to our knowledge of Johnson's reading while at Oxford. This collection consisted of some eighty-five different works (in 115 volumes), every one of which has been identified and described ; it contained, in addition to many Latin authors (Greek literature is not very well represented) and some works of a general nature, the following English writers : Spenser, Milton (an odd volume only of " Poems "), Waller, Butler, Dryden, Prior, Addison, Garth, Pope, Smith, Ambrose Philips, Blackmore, and Young ; there are no French or Italian works, although Lobo's *Abyssinia* was translated from the French in 1733-34 (published 1735) and a beginning made on the abortive translation from the Italian of Father Paul in 1738.

Mr. Reade in his final chapters follows Johnson to Stourbridge, Market Bosworth, Birmingham, and Great Haywood, in his efforts, successful and unsuccessful, to obtain employment. The latter half of the book consists of appendices into which is packed a vast amount of information, much of which will be valuable to workers in other than Johnsonian fields ; thus Appendices B to G are devoted, respectively, to Jorden, Johnson's first tutor, Phil. Jones who loved beer, Fludyer (or as he preferred to call himself Fludger) the Whig, " Honest Jack Meeke " whose classical superiority Johnson found unbearable, Oliver Edwards who failed to become a philosopher because " cheerfulness was always breaking in," and Matthew Bloxam the pluralist ; Appendix J contains a short account of every member of Pembroke College whose name was on the books at any time during Johnson's residence ; Appendices A, M, N, P are family histories, of which the most important is that of the Astons, among whom were numbered many of Johnson's friends ; Appendix K gives a detailed description of Johnson's undergraduate collection of books ; Appendix H is the *pièce de resistance*, an account of the buttery-books with an analysis of Johnson's battels. An Index that fills forty-four pages, in double columns, speaks for itself.

Mr. Reade's work is beyond all praise. Suffice it to say that I have subjected it to the severest of tests—use ; and that it has come through unscathed.¹ The accuracy of the press is remarkable.

L. F. POWELL.

P.S.—Mr. Reade has not seen the *Sermons*. . . . By the late Reverend and Learned Mr. Edward Brodhurst (Birmingham, 1733), in the Preface to which Mr. Joseph Hill saw Johnson's hand. If he had, he would have learnt, from the epitaph by Dr. Watts, that Brodhurst was born in Derbyshire in 1691 and died at Birmingham, July 21, 1730 ; he would also, I think, have differed from Mr. Hill. Thanks to the friendly aid of Mr. H. M. Cashmore, I have been able to inspect this rare volume. We do not expect to find Johnson's finished style in 1733, but its characteristics are well marked in the Preface to Lobo's *Abyssinia*, written about this time. I find no trace of them in this other Preface, which is quite pedestrian and might have been written by anybody.—L. F. P.

New Essays by Oliver Goldsmith. Now first collected and edited with an Introduction and Notes. By RONALD S. CRANE. Chicago : University of Chicago Press ; Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. 1927. Pp. xli+147. 15s. net.

PROFESSOR CRANE in this book reprints as from Goldsmith's hand eighteen essays originally contributed to five periodicals (*The British Magazine*, *The Royal Magazine*, *The Public Ledger*, *The Lady's Magazine*, and *Lloyd's Evening Post*) between January 1760 and June 1762. Their ascription to Goldsmith is made on both internal and external evidence ; the former does not reside in mere similarity of style and diction, but rests on precise parallelism of thought and expression with Goldsmith's acknowledged writings ; the latter consists of two kinds : Goldsmith's known connection with three of the periodicals in question and the fact that nine of the essays form part of two series other essays of which were acknowledged by him. This evidence is hardly conclusive, and not all of the eighteen can be safely added to the canon ; but Professor Crane has made out a

¹ The note * on p. 105 needs some correction. The " loose piece " by Sir John Floyer which Johnson thought worth preserving was not, as Boswell gives us to understand, Sir John's *Treatise on Cold Baths*, a work originally published in 1697, but " A letter from the late Sir John Floyer to Mr. King . . . in Recommendation of the Cold Bath " (1726). Mr. Reade's note equates these two works.

strong case for most of them. He himself has doubts about two, which he reprints "chiefly with a view to providing a starting-point for further investigation." About one of these, the first essay, I am more than doubtful. It is entitled "A Letter supposed to be written by the Moorish Secretary in London, to his Correspondent in Fez" and Professor Crane's chief warrant for reprinting it is the possibility that it represents a design for a series of *Moroccan Letters*, which Goldsmith abandoned in favour of the *Chinese Letters*. There is no evidence, except a tradition reported by Prior in 1837, for this scheme; while there is solid evidence that as early as 1758 Goldsmith intended to make his hero "talk Chinese." There is also no evidence for Goldsmith's connection with Smollett's *British Magazine* as early as January 1760: Prior's statement, fully accepted by Gibbs and not expressly repudiated by Professor Crane, that the essay on "The Bravery of the English Common Soldiers" is not to be found in the early editions of the *Idler*, is untrue; this essay is to be found in the third edition, published in 1767, and is undoubtedly Johnson's.

Of the essays themselves Professor Crane says, "In an anthology of Goldsmith's most perfect pages none of them would find a place." Most readers will concur, nevertheless they are well worth this scholarly and charmingly produced reprint. The last essay, "The Revolution in Low Life," is the most important; it is in fact a first sketch of the *Deserted Village*, and adds to the growing opinion that "the immediate social background of that poem must be sought in England, not in Ireland, and that historically the lament over the ruins of Auburn must be regarded as simply the most memorable of a long series of pamphlets called forth in the sixties and seventies of the eighteenth century by the English agricultural revolution." This essay also contains a passage which is strikingly similar to the opening of the fourth chapter of the *Vicar of Wakefield*, and, it is interesting to note, provides one more variant of a formula of which Goldsmith was fond, "a land of tyrants and a den of slaves." Professor Crane suggests as its source a passage in the *Literary Magazine* (1756), in which Jamaica is described as "a place of great wealth and dreadful wickedness, a den of tyrants and a dungeon of slaves"; but he omits to tell us that the author of this was "Doctor Major." With the works of "Doctor Minor" Professor Crane is thoroughly familiar.

L. F. POWELL.

Oliver Goldsmith. The Vicar of Wakefield. Edited with Introduction and Notes by OSWALD DOUGHTY. The Scholartis Press. 1928. Pp. liv+243. 8s. 6d. net.

MR. DOUGHTY has missed a great opportunity. Instead of giving us a real critical edition of Goldsmith's masterpiece, he has been content to reprint the fifth edition, "occasionally corrected from the earlier editions," without indicating where the corrections occur or when they were made. We have always known that Goldsmith made certain drastic changes in the second edition, but no English editor, so far as I am aware, has recorded the minute variations, which I believe to be numerous, in single words and punctuation, between the first and second editions, or has considered the question of subsequent revision. It would be not merely interesting but instructive in the highest degree to watch the processes by which Goldsmith reached perfection of style.

In his Introduction Mr. Doughty assembles the various and varying accounts of the sale of the manuscript by Johnson, relates the facts of the publication of the book, collects the criticisms of notable writers, British and foreign, of the story, and gives at some length his own estimate of it. The notes to the text are for the most part derived from Austin Dobson. I failed to find any account of the philoprogenitive Count Abensberg mentioned in the first chapter.

The book, like other publications of the Scholartis Press, is admirably printed and misprints are few. The following are worth noting: p. xi, "Mr. Johnson . . . sent away the bottle" for "Mr. Johnson . . . set away the bottle" (this error was first made in the second edition of Boswell's *Life of Johnson* and repeated by Birkbeck Hill); p. xxxii, "voleurs" for "voleurs" (repeated from *The Private Correspondence of David Garrick*, i, 493); p. 1, "deep-mouth" for "deep-mouthed"; and p. 32, "our unnecessary blow" for "one unnecessary blow." The lack of adequate references is to be deplored; sometimes the title of a book is given without any further indication, and sometimes we are left to discover for ourselves the book quoted.

L. F. POWELL.

The Life and Works of Edward Moore. By JOHN HOMER CASKEY. New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1927. Pp. vi+202. \$2.00.

THIS study gives an account of the whole work of Moore and also describes his relations with his contemporaries, more especially with Garrick. It supersedes the dissertation of Hugo Beyer, written in 1889, and will in future rank as the chief authority on Moore. Dr. Caskey has spared no pains to make his monograph as exhaustive as possible, and traces in detail Moore's activities as a writer of songs, fables, political panegyrics and society verses, as the editor of *The World*, and above all as a playwright. He discusses Moore's sources, the stage history of his plays, current opinion of his work at home and abroad and his after-fame in England and America and on the Continent. At many points we have interesting glimpses of eminent personages in the literary, musical, political and theatrical world, as well as in the society of the period.

Dr. Caskey is well versed in eighteenth-century literature, and his study is based on first-hand information. Exceptionally, where his knowledge is second-hand, as in his account of the influence exercised by *The Gamester* in Germany, he says so with a pleasing candour. For all the meticulous care he bestows on Moore, Dr. Caskey avoids the tendency, so natural in writers of monographs, to overrate the importance of his theme. His judgments are sane and shrewd. Only once do we feel inclined to disagree—when he calls *The Gamester* a great play. Important, no doubt, in view of its widespread influence at home and abroad, but hardly great.

Relatively little is known of the early part of Moore's life, and Dr. Caskey is sometimes driven to speculation. Not infrequently we are told, "It is possible," "It is probable," "It may well have been. . . . On the other hand it may have been." Again, when Moore remains but a short time at the academy at East Orchard, Dr. Caskey remarks, "Perhaps he had shown some weariness of formal studies, was eager to enter upon a career in business, and was sent there to encourage him in self-reliance." And when Moore is apprenticed to a linen-draper, Dr. Caskey wonders "whether he, or his uncle, or perhaps his mother, made the choice." But such fruitless speculations are exceptional and by no means characteristic of Dr. Caskey's work.

On p. 19, Dr. Caskey claims for Moore that he "aroused a dormant interest in the writing and reading of fables." Is he not unjust to Gay, whose importance is recognised in the words of Belfour quoted on the same page? It seems rather as if Moore helped to strengthen an interest already aroused by Gay.

On p. 66, note 38, Dr. Caskey "suspects" that Dr. Franklin married Moore and Miss Hamilton, and on p. 72, note 44, that the place where the marriage was celebrated was not Audley Chapel, Grosvenor Square, but Grosvenor Chapel, South Audley Street. It is a pity that he does not give his reasons.

There are few typographical errors in the book. On p. 126, l. 27, "at" should be "et" and Bridgwater in Somerset wrongly appears on several occasions as Bridgewater. But the few criticisms we have made are insignificant compared with the merits of this thorough and scholarly piece of work.

HERBERT G. WRIGHT.

Bangor.

Collins. By H. W. GARROD. 8°. Pp. 123. Clarendon Press. 1928. 5s. net.

The Poetry of Collins. By H. W. GARROD. (Warton Lecture on English Poetry.) Humphrey Milford: Oxford University Press, London, E.C. 1928. Pp. 20. 1s. net.

IN this challenging book Professor Garrod attempts a re-estimation of the poetry of Collins. He holds his course between the poles of praise and blame represented by Swinburne and Dr. Johnson, with something of a bias towards the Johnsonian point of view and with what seems at times a deliberate cultivation of Johnsonian turns of expression.

"Hardly a single false note," . . . "purity of music," . . . "clarity of style." . . . These phrases from Swinburne's eulogy of Collins are quoted with justifiable disapproval. Professor Garrod might have put beside them an equally extreme judgment from a more recent writer on Collins:

He is the least mannered, not only among the poets of his own time, but almost in the whole body of our poetry. Language in his hands

becomes absolutely or almost absolutely translucent (J. W. Mackail, "Collins," *Trans. Roy. Soc. Lit.*, 1921, p. 18).

Professor Garrod disagrees with views such as these, and his book is an effort to arrive at a saner estimate.

It opens with an admirable chapter on Collins and the Wartons. "Both of them, I think, had a good deal to do with making him a poet." Collins was undoubtedly more than usually sensitive to the influences of literary friendship, and Professor Garrod shows real understanding of the important share taken by the Wartons in the evolution of his poetic outlook. A chapter on Collins and Gray follows. Professor Garrod holds that "Gray went as far as he could go." "The best of Gray exhibits immortal perfections—perfections of a kind that are not to be discovered in Collins, even in the best of Collins. Of Collins's poetry the glory resides not in its perfections but in its potentialities." The rest of the volume is given over to a commentary on the odes. Much in this commentary is incontestable, but there are moments when the author seems over-fastidious, notably in his criticism of the Ode to Evening and of the Passions. Collins's chief defect, according to Professor Garrod, is to be found in "the vicious quality of his diction." "I think it is likely that there is no better education in poetry than can be won by distinguishing between the true and the false in Collins." He essays this task. Much of the poet's obscurity he ascribes to laziness. It is a novel point of view; and Professor Garrod thrusts aside too lightly a considerable body of evidence which shows that Collins subjected his poetry to painstaking revision. His obscurities of style and diction to my mind did not proceed in the main from carelessness, but rather from taking too much care; we must look elsewhere than to mere indolence for their source.

Collins's style often became obscure and involved in his efforts to attain that sublimity and elevation which he considered proper to the ode. But it was a conscious complexity; he could be simple enough when he liked. Witness "How sleep the brave," which Professor Garrod considers the only poem of Collins "of which I should call the music throughout pure." Another source of obscurity is to be found in what Hazlitt so happily calls his "honied paste of poetic diction." Collins was steeped in the language of the elder poets. He borrowed with both hands; and what he borrowed he changed, often wresting a word or phrase out of its just meaning in pursuit of novelty. An analysis of his vocabulary reveals a number

of usages for which parallels will be sought in vain in the *N.E.D.* A third source of obscurity remains. It was not "indolence" which led Collins to write :

O stay thee, Agib, for my feet deny,
No longer friendly to my life, to fly (*Oriental Ecl. IV*),

but a conscious and deliberate attempt to impose Latin idiom on the English language. A similar explanation accounts for "the obscure use of the pronominal adjective," which is, as Professor Garrod justly observes, "a characteristic blemish of Collins's style," and one that "leaves his best stanzas, sometimes from this cause only, almost unintelligible."¹ (He is, I believe, the first critic of Collins to note this characteristic feature of the poet.) He might well have put side by side with this another characteristic blemish, the strained and involved appositions in which Collins sometimes indulges. Two examples must suffice :

When first Distress with dagger keen
Broke forth to waste his destin'd scene,
His wild unsated foe. (*Ode to Pity.*)

O'er him whose doom thy virtues grieve
Aërial forms shall sit at eve,
And bend the pensive head ;
And, fall'n to save his injur'd land,
Imperial Honour's awful hand
Shall point his lonely bed. (*Ode on the death of Col. Ross.*)

But the Latin elements in the diction of Collins deserve lengthier treatment than can be given to them in a book review.

Some details may now be noted. Professor Garrod writes (p. 39) : "In the bibliographies of Collins nothing is said of Fawkes and Woty's reprint." It is, however, mentioned in Professor Bronson's bibliography : Collins, Bronson, p. lxxxii. Professor Garrod refers (p. 39) to "the revived interest in Collins . . . which created a demand for four editions of his works between 1765 and 1781." His case is strengthened when we remember that in addition to the four editions mentioned by him, the works of Collins

¹ Professor Garrod cites, *inter alia*,

O Thou, who bad'st thy Turtles bear
Swift from his Grasp thy golden Hair,
And sought'st thy native Skies :
When *War*, by Vultures drawn from far
To *Britain* bent his Iron Car
And bad his Storms arise !
Ode to Peace.

were published by Foulis in 1771, and reprinted in 1777. (Professor Garrod mentions only Foulis's folio Collins of 1787.) Another edition of the poet's works was published by Balfour and Crutch, Edinburgh, 1773. (For the foregoing, see Bronson, *op. cit.*, pp. lxxxi-lxxxii.) Professor Bronson also records that Collins's poems were reprinted in Johnson's *Works of the English Poets*, vol. xlix (London, 1779); and in Bell's *Poets of Great Britain*, vol. lxxxviii (Edin., 1781). He likewise gives the authority of Dyce for an edition of Langhorne's Collins in 1771, which, so far, I have been unable to trace. In addition to these, the Oriental Eclogues appeared in Goldsmith's *Beauties of English Poetry*, vol. i, pp. 239-253, 1767, and also in *Poems for Young Ladies*, pp. 228-241, 1767. These have not, so far as I know, been noted in any bibliography of Collins. Furthermore, the Eclogues and Odes were frequently reprinted in the periodicals of the period.

Professor Garrod (p. 56) places Collins's projected *History of the Revival of Learning*—the exact title of this proposed work, by the way, was *A Review of the Advancement of Learning from 1300 to 1521*—after his projected translation of Aristotle's *Poetics*. It is true, we do not know the precise date of the latter; but it must have been considerably later than the issue of the proposals for the *Review of the Advancement of Learning*, which took place prior to July 18, 1744 (see "Letters of William Collins," H. O. White, *R.E.S.*, January 1927, p. 16). In a footnote (p. 72), Professor Garrod mentions three imitations of the Ode to Evening. A long list is given in Professor Haven's *Influence of Milton*, pp. 682-4, which has been considerably supplemented in a recent correspondence in the *Times Literary Supplement*. Professor Garrod (p. 88) has difficulty in understanding the meaning of "the least" in l. 26 of the *Ode to Liberty*. The passage is certainly obscure; but Professor Bronson's explanation, referring it to "Fragments" in the preceding line (*i.e.* the least = the least of these fragments), seems preferable to Professor Garrod's emendation of *she* for *the*.

Professor Garrod notes (p. 89) that Collins was not, as he thought, the first to make "Poetical use" of the "Tradition" that England had once been connected by dry land with France. He observes that this is mentioned in Drayton's *Polyolbion*, Song XVIII. I drew attention to this passage in *Polyolbion* in a letter to the *Times Literary Supplement* for January 12, 1922, as well as to another reference to the same fact in Spenser's *Færie Queen*, II, x, 5. It is

quite possible that Collins had read—and forgotten—both passages. It may perhaps be added that Mulso is misprinted Mulse (p. 115, footnote).

Lovers of Collins may be tempted to feel that in his reaction against the excessive eulogies of Swinburne, Professor Garrod has allowed the swing of the pendulum to carry him too far. He seems at times conscious of this himself, and there is more than one page on which he half apologises for the severity of his attitude. But when every allowance has been made on this count, Professor Garrod's book remains a valuable and stimulating contribution to the study of Collins.

H. O. WHITE.

Crabb Robinson in Germany, 1800-1805. Extracts from his Correspondence. Edited by EDITH J. MORLEY. Oxford University Press. London: Humphrey Milford. 1929. Pp. viii+194. 10s. 6d. net.

PURSuing her general design of printing whatever is of value in the great mass of Crabb Robinson papers in Dr. Williams's Library, Miss Morley has added to the *Correspondence with the Wordsworth Circle* (noticed in *R.E.S.*, vol. iv, p. 361) a slighter but scarcely less interesting instalment. This contains generous extracts from the letters exchanged between Robinson and his brother Thomas during the former's continued absence in Germany from April 1800 to September 1805. A fair amount of the material was, of course, included in Sadler's selection, the *Diary, Reminiscences, and Correspondence* (1869), but—equally of course—far less accurately and conveniently than here. Not only is Sadler notoriously untrustworthy as a transcriber, but his editorial method is particularly unsatisfactory in this part of his work, early- and late-written matter (separated sometimes by half a century) being jumbled together inextricably. Miss Morley has now partly cleared up the mess by enabling us to get a clear idea of how his German experiences struck Robinson at the time (he was thirty in 1805); and we may hope that she will gain our renewed thanks by editing also the reminiscences referring to this period but written down long afterwards. It is clear from Sadler that much of this later material, too different in kind to be conveniently incorporated with the early letters, is not

less interesting and valuable; and its non-inclusion in the present volume may, I think, be taken as indicating that it is to be re-edited separately.

The interest of these early letters, though rather specialised, is indisputable: They cannot, indeed, take high rank as a travel-book. Robinson had little feeling for style, and his descriptions are seldom very vivid. He is too conscientiously minute, and lacks the power of selecting significant detail which, for example, distinguishes C. P. Moritz's naive and charming *Reisen eines Deutschen in England in 1782*.¹ It is, moreover, one of the oddest among Robinson's many unfulfilled possibilities that the sprightliness and high spirits which, we know, made him at all times a thoroughly pleasant companion find little expression in his diary or letters. His amusing description here of "Walzing, that is Rolling or Turning" (p. 30), and his account of a frolic at a village inn, when he impersonated the great Fichte to "pull the leg" of his landlord (p. 154), are rare breaks in the prevailing seriousness.

Yet it must not be supposed that this is merely a useful but dull source-book for the "Research Fiend." In persons (himself included) Robinson was passionately interested; and his words kindle, albeit with a sober flame, as he gives us his first impressions of the innumerable literary and philosophical celebrities (chiefly of the Weimar circle) with whom he became acquainted during his four years' residence at Grimma and Jena. We may be thankful for his unpretending yet faithful sketches of the Jewish-looking Christian Brentano and his tempestuous brother Clemens, of the "pleasingly venerable" Wieland, of Schiller, of Herder, of Mme. de Stäel (then collecting material in Weimar for *De l'Allemagne*), and, last and greatest, of his idol and future friend Goethe:

After a courteous bow to each of us he sat—would you believe it?—precisely in the posture in which Kemble seats himself in *Measure for Measure* when he judges the Judge—*i.e.* with his bent fist on his Knees and with his burning Eyes fixed on the person he was speaking to—I cannot more strongly express my feelings than by saying that I felt in beholding G. during a most insignificant conversation precisely what I have felt in seeing Mrs. Siddons with all the pomp and corroborative aid of Scenery and decorations (p. 99).

It was not till long after that Robinson became intimate with the

¹ The excellent English translation published in 1795 has been reprinted, edited by Mr. Matheson, in one of the most delightful volumes in *The Oxford Miscellany* (Milford, 1924).

poet ; but his enthusiasm for Goethe, and his intense though more temperate admiration for German literature and philosophy in general, date from this first visit. Undoubtedly Robinson did a good deal to spread the fame of Goethe and his contemporaries in England, though less by his writings than by conversational propaganda. Miss Morley, indeed, believes that " to him, more than to any one else, is due the influence of German thought and German literature on England in the first quarter of the nineteenth century." It is not easy to make a fair estimate. We must not lay too much stress on the slightness of Robinson's critical essays and translations ; yet in justice we must, I think, rank him below Taylor of Norwich and Coleridge both as a " carrier " and—more obviously—as an assimilator of ideas in the world of German culture.

An incidental yet by no means insignificant thread of interest running through these letters is the gradual change of Robinson's political opinions from republicanism and an emphatic " approbation of the great leading doctrines of Godwin " to a very different state of mind. In January 1801 he could ask : " Do the people continue as stupidly loyal as ever ? " but in July 1803 he writes :

In this war I confess I am ministerially inclined, and feel an anxiety and apprehension much greater than I felt during the last War. . . . You will hardly, in spite of the hand, believe that it is *I* who write ; that I should now be repeating the commonplaces of the tories—but so it is, in the revolution of events, opinions cannot but accompany them (p. 127).

A year later he characterises " Buonaparte's Elevation to the Imperial dignity " as " the best termination of a dull joke " ; and in June 1805, on the eve of his return, he declares himself disposed to favour that party in England " which is most decidedly against the French." Yet in theory at least Robinson never fully abjured Godwinism ; as late as 1804 he writes : " In spite of my change of opinions I still am attached to Godwin, indeed . . . it is very easy to connect him with or rather to draw him over to the German school " ; and in later life he described himself as " a conservative Whig." All this makes a curious and interesting parallel to, and helps to an understanding of, the change of outlook in Wordsworth and Coleridge which to men like Hazlitt and Shelley appeared an " apostasy." In fact, Godwin had left his mark on the elder poets, and much as they hated the Reform Bill they remained, like Robinson, reformers too after their fashion.

Miss Morley's editing is of the same conscientious and almost painful accuracy as in the *Wordsworth Circle*. Monsters like "parlarly" (= "particularly") and "imp^l Co^l" (= "Imperial Court") are left unexpanded—surely square brackets are the proper expedient here—and the punctuation, or lack of it, mostly remains as in the originals, though here and there it is supplemented rather casually (e.g. pp. 90, 94; contrast p. 26, foot, where the sense as it stands is hard to gather). The notes are good, but there are scarcely enough of them. One would like to know whether the account of Watt's assistant Richard (pp. 77-8) is true; and since a fairly simple allusion like "Smelfungus" is explained (p. 93), brief notes on the list of names at the foot of p. 49 might be expected. On p. 100 it should have been noted that the "Translator of Wallenstein" whom Schiller accused of "ridiculous blunders" was Coleridge.¹ Probable misprints (or miscopyings) are "Any" for "& my" (p. 81, 5 lines from foot), and "concealed" for "concerned" (p. 113, No. 26, line 3).

R. W. KING.

The School Drama in England. By T. H. VAIL MOTTER.
With illustrations. Longmans, Green & Co., London, New York, Toronto. 1929. Pp. xiv+325. 15s. net.

THIS book, in rather popular form, contains a good deal of information which will be useful to serious students of the drama. Its arrangement, which will perhaps improve its sale, appeals particularly to members of one or other of our great schools, chapters being given in turn to Winchester, Eton, Westminster, Merchant Taylors', St. Paul's, the Charterhouse, Christ's Hospital, Harrow, Rugby and Shrewsbury, while an additional chapter deals with "Some other schools." In the case of each school Mr. Motter has gone to the best printed authorities—often also to some living student of the school's history—and has reproduced the records of early performances of plays where such have been preserved. These

¹ I do not know whether the accuracy of Coleridge's translation has been investigated; but Coleridge himself admitted having made some changes deliberately: "The parts most admired were substitutions of my own, on a principle of compensation," he wrote in 1814 (cf. *Memoir of John Murray*, ed. Smiles, 1891, i, 300). Perhaps Schiller had taken these for "blunders."

to many of us will seem the most important part of the book. In the case of St. Paul's which presents special difficulties he has treated the Choir School and Colet's revived Grammar School separately. Charterhouse, Christ's Hospital, Harrow and Rugby have no early dramatic history, and the chapters devoted to them would be blanks, but that it is part of Mr. Motter's plan to extend his history down to the present day. Hence in some cases we make a curious jump from official Latin plays of the sixteenth century to surreptitious dormitory performances of *Box and Cox* three centuries later. This recent history, however, while causing a certain incongruity, has its interest, even for readers who do not belong to one of these schools. The annual House Plays of Christ's Hospital and Rugby seem to show that play-acting under careful regulation can even in these days be a powerful educational instrument, and one regrets that Shrewsbury, famous for Ashton's plays in the sixteenth century, has dropped even its Speech Day play, owing partly to "the introduction of the Higher Certificate Examination which made rehearsal time at the close of term difficult, if not impossible." [I am told that it has now been found possible to give the play as an evening performance.]

Mr. Motter's style has traces of the Transatlantic: he tells us that the Westminster of 1733-53 was "what we should in our present-day school slang call a 'hard-boiled outfit'" and that Henry VIII "running true to form" destroyed a monastery and diverted its revenues. He speaks of dramatic performances as "offerings," of school-boys as "students," and of their masters as "members of the faculty." He says that St. Paul's stood west of Christ's Hospital and Charterhouse. The "Archbishop of Guam" (p. 160) was probably of "Tuam," Mr. "Danes" (p. 168 n.2) was Mr. "Davies."

G. C. MOORE SMITH.

Bibliography of British History. Stuart Period, 1603-1714.
 Edited by GODFREY DAVIES. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
 1928. Pp. x+459. 21s. net.

THIS bibliography, planned in 1909 as the second volume of a series of three ranging from 1485 to 1910, was intended by the Royal

Historical Society and the American Historical Association, under whose auspices it appears, to be the modern sequel to Gross's *Sources and Literature of English History from the Earliest Times to about 1485*.

The century is viewed as a whole ; the sixteen subsections divided again into bibliographies, sources and later works, have been compiled wholly or in part by specialists, and the whole volume has enjoyed the generous aid and unrivalled knowledge of Sir Charles Firth. Unlike its proto-type, this bibliography adheres with few exceptions to the chronological method ; items appear not in reference to their relevance in subject-matter to their neighbours, but in order of date of publication. If, as the editor alleges, we may thus " trace the progress of knowledge and the different interpretations of events in each age," this is a dubious compensation for finding the writings of Sir Edward Coke scattered between numbers 458-564, and the Miscellaneous Works of Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon (1727), hidden in a footnote to number 2238, in the subsection on Education, while his other writings appear under numbers 69 and 93. The serious researcher will lament the inconsistent treatment of manuscript sources ; some of the Reports of the Historical Manuscripts Commission are included in the numbered items, but the great collections of Tanner and Clarendon Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library shrink from publicity in a footnote ; and there is no indication that neither the Clarendon nor the Nicholas Manuscripts terminate with the year 1660.

To the student of Literature, the sub-section on Ballads (compiled by Sir Charles Firth) and that on Journalism will be most useful, but he must add to the first Norman Ault's excellent edition of *Seventeenth-Century Lyrics* (1928) and to the second Walter Graham's *The Beginnings of English Literary Periodicals* (1926). The general literary bibliography suffers from the chronological method, and though in a volume of 3858 numbered items and 1500 to 2000 footnotes, much in the way of omissions may be forgiven, we confess it is difficult to pardon the neglect of Traherne and the exclusion of Mr. Margoliouth's edition of *The Poems and Letters of Andrew Marvell* (1927), indispensable alike to the student of history and literature, while if Legouis' penetrating study of *André Marvell* was too recent for insertion, it should certainly be added to any re-issue.

Bibliographies and anthologies are peculiarly vulnerable to

criticism, and this bibliography is no exception to the rule, but in spite of its sins of commission and omission, it will be welcomed by the student and the teacher, for it supplies a definite need and if used intelligently, with due attention to footnotes, should stimulate study in the century to which it is devoted.

M. COATE.

Bibliographia Aberdonensis: Being an account of books relating to or printed in the Shires of Aberdeen, Banff, Kincardine, or written by natives or residents or by officers, graduates or alumni of the Universities of Aberdeen. By JAMES FOWLER KELLAS JOHNSTONE, LL.D., and ALEXANDER WEBSTER ROBERTSON. 1472-1640. Aberdeen: Printed for the Third Spalding Club. 1929. Pp. xii+316+15.

THIS is the first volume of a work which was planned in 1887, when it was to be compiled for the New Spalding Club by Mr. Alexander W. Robertson of the Aberdeen Public Library. Intended as a bibliography of the district "within the view of the Club," its scope has been gradually enlarged and at the same time made more precise, until it corresponds with the definition of the present sub-title. Naturally the work was found on investigation to be much larger than was at first contemplated, and instead of its being completed in two years as was hoped, the first part has now been published forty-three years after the drawing-up of the original plan. From 1896 Mr. Kellas Johnstone was associated with the work, taking gradually a larger share in it until, after Robertson's death in 1911, he assumed the sole charge of it. Dr. Johnstone himself died in 1928, and the editorship finally devolved upon the secretary of the Third Spalding Club, Dr. W. Douglas Simpson, who has seen this volume through the press and hopes to complete the undertaking by the publication of a second volume during 1930.

The work is planned on the most elaborate scale. The entries of books are alphabetical by authors within years; titles and full bibliographical descriptions being given as well as many valuable annotations, including notes on the authors. These serve to explain, *inter alia*, their connection with the district, and in the case of the less-known persons take the form of a condensed biography, including, it would seem, in many cases, a large amount of new matter.

These biographical notes naturally appear only at the first entry of a work by the author, and their usefulness will be much increased by the index, which is promised with the second volume. The volume is illustrated by more than sixty facsimiles in half-tone, which add greatly to its value. It was perhaps intended to include even more of these, for under the entries "Almanac" in the years 1623 and 1624 there are references to facsimiles which do not appear in the book.

The author attributes a number of works printed in the first third of the sixteenth century to Alexander Barclay. These include *The art of good lywyng*, the translation of the *Compost et Kalendrier des bergiers* known as the *Kalender of Shepherdes*, *The castell of laboure*, and a series of small devotional tracts printed 1521-1529, besides several other books described in the Supplement, such as *Kynge Appolyn of Thyre*, *The knyght of the swanne*, *Cocke Lorelles bote*, *The hye way to the Spyttell hous*, and other popular works generally regarded as the productions of Robert Copland. The reasons for the attributions seem to be in the main general considerations of style, but on p. 25 (last line) we are referred to Barclay's "long and peculiar literary association with [Robert Copland] the printer." This is a matter which seems to need further elucidation: in what exactly did this association consist? I cannot help questioning the advisability of these considerable additions to Barclay's recognised output, but they have at least brought a number of rare items within the purview of this book and thus led to their being accurately described, which is all to the good. It may be remarked that conjectural attributions are not always indicated, thus Barclay's name is enclosed in square brackets in the entries of the *Kalender of Shepherdes*, 1503, 1506, and elsewhere, but not in the entries of the 1508 and 1510 editions.

The details of bibliographical work of this sort cannot of course be discussed here, but the *Bibliographia Aberdonensis* may be recommended to the notice of students of English literature as an invaluable conspectus of the output of an important and productive district, and as affording much information about a large number of scarce works.

R. B. McKERROW.

OTHER BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS RECEIVED.

The number of books and pamphlets received by R.E.S. for review is so large that it is impossible to deal adequately with all of them. It is proposed therefore in future not, as a rule, to notice pamphlets otherwise than by printing from time to time a list of those received. Reprints from periodicals cannot be included in such lists.

Lord Macaulay: the Pre-eminent Victorian. S. C. ROBERTS. (Eng. Assoc. Pamphlet, No. 67.) Milford, O.U.P. 1927. Pp. 18. 2s. net.

The Idea of an English Association. Sir HENRY NEWBOLT, C.H., D.Litt. (Eng. Assoc. Pamphlet No. 70.) Milford, O.U.P. 1928. Pp. 13. 2s. net.

The Novels of Thomas Hardy. J. H. FOWLER. (Eng. Assoc. Pamphlet No. 71.) Milford, O.U.P. 1928. Pp. 18. 2s. net.

Shakespeare's English. GEORGE GORDON. (S.P.E. Tract No. 29.) Clarendon Press. 1928. Pp. 24 (pp. 253-276). 2s. 6d. net.

Needed Words. LOGAN PEARSALL SMITH. (S.P.E. Tract No. 31.) Clarendon Press. 1928. Pp. 23. 2s. 6d. net.

Machiavelli and the Elizabethans. MARIO PRAZ. (Annual Italian lecture of the British Academy.) From the proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. XIII. Humphrey Milford. 1928. Pp. 52. 3s. net.

A Bibliography of the Poetics of Aristotle. LANE COOPER and ALFRED GUDEMAN. (Cornell Studies in English No. 11.) New Haven: Yale U.P. London: Milford, O.U.P. 1928. Pp. xiv + 194. 9s. net.

Margaret Fuller as a Literary Critic. HELEN NEILL McMASTER. (Monographs in English: No. 1.) University of Buffalo Studies. 1928. Pp. 100.

"Henry VI. Parts II and III." Their Relation to the Contention and the True Tragedy. MADELEINE DORAN. (Humanistic Studies, Vol. IV, No. 4.) Iowa Univ.: Iowa City, U.S.A. August 15, 1928. Pp. 88.

Die Neun Dichter des Hamlet. WILHELM MARSHALL. Shakespeare-Bausteine-Verlag. Guenther Marstrand. Heidelberg-Rohrbach. 1928. Pp. 75. RM.4.20.

The Drama in Modern Wales. OLIVE ELY HART. University of Pennsylvania Press. 1928. Pp. 96.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

By H. WINIFRED HUSBANDS

ANGLIA, Vol. LIII. (Neue Folge XLI.), December 1929—

Ags. *neorxenawang* (W. Krogmann), pp. 337-44.

Susos Horologium Sapientiae in England nach Handschriften des 15. Jahrhunderts (Schluss) (Wiltrud Wichgraf), pp. 345-73.

Die Stelle vom "Rauhen Pyrrhus" (*Hamlet*, II. II. 460-551) in ihrem Verhältnis zu Marlowe-Nashes "Dido," zu Seneca und dem "Urhamlet" und damit ihrer Bedeutung für Datierungsfragen, Quartoprobem und Nashes Angriff auf Thomas Kyd (Else v. Schaubert), pp. 374-439.

Robert Southey (Schluss) (Helene Richter), pp. 440-64.

Bemerkung zum Aufsatz von Kemp Malone, S. 335 f. (Eugen Einkenkel), p. 439.

BODLEIAN QUARTERLY RECORD, Vol. VI., October 1929—

The Letters of Mary Shelley in the Bodleian Collection, pp. 51-59.

Hitherto unpublished letters of 1818 and 1819 to Maria Gisborne.

BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY, Vol. 14, January 1930—

A Medieval Collection of Latin and English Proverbs and Riddles (W. A. Pantin), pp. 81-114.

CORNHILL MAGAZINE, November 1929—

The Chronology in Thackeray's Novels (W. A. Hirst), pp. 553-63.

December—

Johnson's Hatred of America (Charles W. Harvey), pp. 655-68.

The Servants in Jane Austen (Lady Balfour), pp. 694-705.

February 1930—

Reminiscences of Oscar Wilde (A. H. Cooper-Prichard), pp. 144-54.

The Ettrick Shepherd: An Unpublished Letter (Mary B. Whiting), pp. 193-202.

ENGLISCHE STUDIEN, Vol. 64, December 1929 (Schick-Festschrift)—

Josef Schick (Robert Spindler), pp. 177-200.

Altenglisch *geap*, *horngæp*, *sægeap* (Johannes Hoops), pp. 201-11.

Zur Bedeutung von ae. *stede-heard* (*Judiith*, 223) (Otto L. Jiriczek), pp. 212-18.

Etymological Notes (E. Ekwall), pp. 219-26.

Some Cheshire place-names.

Some Etymological Notes (R. E. Zachrisson), pp. 227-28.

Borgeret, Borred; Adalaver; Briar.

Nachtrag zu den Umschriften ags. Urkunden in der Max-Förster-Festschrift (Lorenz Morsbach), pp. 229-37.

Sprachindividualität und Sprachtypus im Englischen (A. Schröer), pp. 238-51.

Zur Kontamination bei Chaucer (Fritz Karpf), pp. 252-60.

Mittelalter und Antike bei Lydgate (F. Brie), pp. 261-301.

Nic. Udalls *Roister Doister*. Metrisch übersetzt von F. Holthausen, pp. 302-19.

Zur Datierung von Marlowes *Faust* (H. M. Flasdieck), pp. 320-51.

Love's Labour's Lost und *As You Like It* als Hofaufführungen (A. Eichler), pp. 352-61.

Der *König-Lear*-Text des Wiener Burgtheaters von 1780 (Karl Brunner), pp. 362-69.

Zur Rolle des Thersites in Shakespeares *Troilus and Cressida* (Eduard Eckhardt), pp. 370-79.

Cowpers Ballade *John Gilpin*: Textgestalt, Verbreitung und Fortsetzungen (Max Förster), pp. 380-416.

Zu J. B. Whites Sonett auf die Nacht (Otto Ritter), pp. 417-18.

Thomas und Jane Carlyle im Spiegel der Briefe Amely Böltes an Varnhagen von Ense (1844-1853) (Walther Fischer), pp. 419-33.

Pessimistische Strömungen im englischen Geistesleben des 19. Jahrhunderts (Paul Meissner), pp. 434-49.

Zur "Erlebten Rede" bei Galsworthy (Otto Funke), pp. 450-74.

Typologische Literaturbetrachtung (Bernhard Fehr), pp. 475-81.

ENGLISH STUDIES, Vol. XI., December 1929—

Alleyne's player's part of Greene's *Orlando Furioso*, and the text of the Q of 1594 (Concluded) (B. A. P. van Dam), pp. 209-20.

Vol. XII., February 1930—

The Passive of a Verb accompanied by a Preposition (W. van der Gaaf), pp. 1-24.

Contributions to English Syntax: The Verbal *-ing* in Living English (1) (E. Kruisinga), pp. 24-31.

HERRIGS ARCHIV FÜR DAS STUDIUM DER NEUEREN SPRACHEN UND LITERATUREN, Vol. 156 (New Series 56), December 1929—

Auf den Spuren Susos in England (G. Schleich), pp. 184-94.

Shakespeare und Marlowe (Alfred Stern), pp. 195-202.

Zwei Kleinigkeiten zu Dickens (Albert Ludwig), pp. 235-37.

On Dickens and Sterne, and the *Tale of Two Cities*.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 251

Brownings *Fra Filippo Lippi* und Lope de Vega (Arthur Altschul), pp. 250-53.

JOURNAL OF ENGLISH AND GERMANIC PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXVIII., October 1929—

Coleridge's Reading of Mendelssohn's *Morgenstunden* and *Jerusalem* (Alice D. Snyder), pp. 503-17.

LIBRARY, Vol. X., December 1929—

Some Poetical Miscellanies of the Early Eighteenth Century (Iolo A. Williams), pp. 233-51.

Extant Autograph Material by Shakespeare's Fellow Dramatists (Henrietta C. Bartlett), pp. 308-12.

The Library of the Royal College of Physicians in the Great Fire (Eleanore Boswell), pp. 313-26.

The Revels Books of 1604-5 and 1611-12 (T. W. Baldwin), pp. 327-38.

The Early Editions of Thomas Dekker's *The Converted Courtezan* or *The Honest Whore*, Part I. (Frank Marcham), p. 339.

LIFE AND LETTERS, Vol. III., December 1929—

Boswell's Tact (Mrs. Clement Parsons), pp. 503-13.

— Vol. IV., January 1930—

Coventry Patmore (W. K. Fleming), pp. 27-40.

The Strange Case of Dr. Beddoes (F. L. Lucas), pp. 55-73.

LONDON MERCURY, Vol. XXI., January 1930—

A New Admirer for Dr. Johnson (Aleyn Lyell Reade), pp. 243-53.

Recently discovered letters from Mrs. Nicholas to Mrs. William Hayley and others.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. XLIV., December 1929—

The Manciple's Prologue (R. K. Root), pp. 493-96.

Evidence that the Manciple's Tale was the first of the homeward journey.

Chaucer's Man of Law at the Parvis (George L. Frost), pp. 496-501.

Defence of traditional explanation.

Some Linguistic Studies of 1928 (Kemp Malone), pp. 502-11.

The Round Table Again (Laura H. Loomis), pp. 511-19.

Further evidence of Christian origin.

Two Spenser Notes (H. M. Belden), pp. 526-31.

On Florimell, Proteus and Helen, and on Britomart's Nurse.

The Elizabethan "To board" (Hazelton Spencer), pp. 531-32.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW, Vol. XXV., January 1930—

Proper Names in the Old English *Orosius*, 1 (Ann Kirkman), pp. 1-22.

A Nice Derangement: The Irregular Verse-Lining in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, Act v, Sc. i, ll. 1-84 (Hazelton Spencer), pp. 23-29.

Reply by J. Dover Wilson, pp. 29-31.

Beowulf, ll. 1543 ff. (Margaret Ashdown), p. 78.

The Date of Ohthere's Voyage to Hæthum (Kemp Malone), pp. 78-81.

The William Cartwright of the Beaumont and Fletcher First Folio
(F. S. Boas), pp. 81-82.

The Oxford scholar and dramatist.

The Faithful Virgins (W. J. Lawrence), pp. 82-83.

A Newly Discovered Draft of Gray's Lines, "William Shakespeare
to Mrs. Anne" (Paget Toynbee), pp. 83-85.

An Unpublished Letter from John Thelwall to S. T. Coleridge
(Warren E. Gibbs), pp. 85-90.

Two Unpublished Letters by Joseph Cooper Walker to Bishop Percy
(R. Pribsch), pp. 90-95.

On Sotheby's translation of Wieland's *Oberon*.

MODERN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXVII., November 1929—

The Sources of the Characters in *The Shoemaker's Holiday* (W. K.
Chandler), pp. 175-82.

William Congreve in the Government Service (John C. Hodges),
pp. 183-92.

Samuel Taylor Coleridge at Malta (Earl L. Griggs), pp. 201-17.
Account based on hitherto unpublished letters.

NEOPHILOLOGUS, Vol. 15, 1930—

The Degrees of Comparison of the English Adjective (R. Volbeda),
pp. 112-26.

NINETEENTH CENTURY AND AFTER, Vol. CVII., January 1930—

Conrad and the Younger Generation (Richard Curle), pp. 103-12.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 157, November 16, 1929—

"Portmanteau" and Pseudo-"Portmanteau" Words (Charles
Strachey), p. 359.

Aerobat.

December 21—

Chapel Plaister (S. O. Addy), p. 447.

Origin of name?

December 28—

The Language of Delagoa Bay in the Seventeenth Century (R. C.
Temple), pp. 455-56.

Vol. 158, January 11, 1930—

A Lincolnshire Place-Name: Barnetby-le-Wold (A. Anscombe),
pp. 24-25.

January 18—

A Neglected Factor in Place-Names (R. L.), p. 49.

Tracks for transport of salt; Ceylonese parallel.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 253

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, Vol. VIII., October 1929—

- New Material on Jeremy Taylor (Marjorie Nicolson), pp. 321-34.
In unpublished letters concerning members of the Conway family.
- High Comedy in Terms of Restoration Practice (B. V. Crawford),
pp. 339-47.
- Fighting in the Churchyard (A. H. R. Fairchild), pp. 388-94.
On *Hamlet*, v. i.
- "Tim Bobbin" again (Harold Whitehall), pp. 395-405.
On the Lancashire dialect and its literature.
- A Note on *Beowulf* 2928 and 2932 (Kemp Malone), pp. 406-7.
Relative ages of Onther and Onela.
- Romeo and Juliet*, i. iv. 86; an Emendation (R. W. Babcock),
pp. 407-8.
- Southey's Monodramas (E. C. Knowlton), pp. 408-10.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, Vol. XLIV., September 1929—

- On the Author of the *Ancren Riwe* (Hope Emily Allen), pp. 635-80.
- The Text of the *Gerusalemme Liberata* in the Versions of Carew and
Fairfax (R. E. Neil Dodge), pp. 681-95.
- Virgilian Allegory and *The Faerie Queene* (Merritt Y. Hughes),
pp. 696-705.
- The Red Crosse Knight and Mediæval Demon Stories (Rosemond
Tuve), pp. 706-14.
- Spenser's Cosmic Philosophy and his Religion (Evelyn M. Albright),
pp. 715-59.
- Notes on Marlowe's *Hero and Leander* (Douglas Bush), pp. 760-64.
Parallels with his translation of Ovid's *Amores*, the *Heroides* and other poems.
- The Authentic Text of *Titus Andronicus* (Joseph S. G. Bolton),
pp. 765-88.
- Records of Players in the Parish of St. Giles, Cripplegate (G. E.
Bentley), pp. 789-826.
- New Allusions to *A Game at Chesse* (Bernard M. Wagner), pp. 827-34.
In news-letters and private correspondence.
- Look About You* and *The Disguises* (Fred L. Jones), pp. 835-41.
Arguments in favour of identity.
- Elizabethan Drama and the Works of Smollett (Lee M. Ellison),
pp. 842-62.
- The Genealogical Novel Again (A. E. Zucher), pp. 925-27.
Note supplementing article in P.M.L.A., June 1928.
- The Word "Universality" as applied to Drama (Clara F. McIntyre),
pp. 927-29.
Note on article by A. R. Thompson on *Melodrama and Tragedy*, P.M.L.A.,
September 1928.
- Orthodoxy concerning Keats (Mary E. Shipman), pp. 929-34.
Reply to R. Snow's *Heresy concerning Keats*, P.M.L.A., December 1928.

- The Drinking Academy* : Corrections (Hyder E. Rollins), p. 934.
 Dr. Greg and the "Goodal" Notation in *Sir Thomas More* (S. A. Tannenbaum), pp. 934-38.
 * Reply to article in P.M.L.A., June 1929 ; rejoinder by Dr. Greg, p. 938.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
 Vol. XLIV., December^s 1929—

Rime and Reason (J. W. Rankin), pp. 997-1004.

Origin of phrase.

Allusions to James I and his Court in Marston's *Fawn* and Beaumont's
Woman Hater (Albert W. Upton), pp. 1048-65.

Butler's *Sidrophel* (Joseph T. Curtiss), pp. 1066-78.

More Popeana : Items from an Unpublished Correspondence (Helen
 S. Hughes), pp. 1090-98.

From letters in the library of Alnwick Castle.

-IAD : A Progeny of the *Dunciad* (Richmond P. Bond), pp. 1099-1105.

New Light on the Burns-Dunlop Estrangement (J. de Lancey Fer-
 guson), pp. 1106-15.

Wordsworth and Philosophy : Suggestions concerning the Source of
 the Poet's Doctrines and the Nature of his Mystical Experience
 (Newton P. Stallknecht), pp. 1116-43.

Wordsworth's *Descriptive Sketches* and *The Prelude*, Book VI (Jannette
 Harrington), pp. 1144-58.

Walt Whitman and Shakespeare (R. C. Harrison), pp. 1201-38.

A Defence of Troilus (J. Milton French), pp. 1246-51.

Reply to J. S. Graydon.

The MS. Source of Caxton's Second Edition of the *Canterbury Tales*
 (W. W. Greg and Margaret Kilgour), pp. 1251-53.

REVUE ANGLO-AMÉRICAINNE, Vol. VII., December 1929—

Tagore et George Russell (A. E.) (Ch.-M. Garnier), pp. 98-112.

The romantisme d'Emerson (C. Cestre), pp. 113-31.

Notes complémentaires au sujet de *Biche-de-Mer* (F. Mossé),
 pp. 143-5.

February 1930—

Chaucer et la dialectique (C. Looten), pp. 193-214.

Coleridgiana (A. Koszul), pp. 247-53.

Full text of letters in the Labouchère collection, and incomplete article on
 Queen Charlotte.

Anglais Papier mâché (S. Derocquigny), pp. 253-54.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXVII., January 1930—

Sordello's Story Retold (William C. De Vane), pp. 1-24.

George Eliot and Humanism (Mathilde Parlett), pp. 25-46.

Carlyle and Novalis (Charles F. Harrold), pp. 47-63.

Charles Reade's Notebooks (Emerson G. Sutcliffe), pp. 64-109.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 255

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, November 7, 1929—

Bracton or Bratton ? (J. E. R. Gover ; A. Mawer), p. 898.

Form and derivation of place-name and personal name.

Reply by Frederick Pollock, November 21, p. 978 ; rejoinder by J. E. R. Gover and A. Mawer, December 5, p. 1032.

November 14—

A Missing Autograph of Shakespeare (S. A. Tannenbaum), p. 926.

Further note on the Parham House copy of Florio's Montaigne.

Reply by C. R. Haines, November 21, p. 978 ; note by W. T. Smedley, December 12, p. 1058.

The Devil of a Duke (Burns Martin), p. 926.

Comparison of Edinburgh (1733) edition with Allan Ramsay's composition book.

The Text of *Eothen* (A. J. H. Moule), p. 926.

Author's MS. corrections. Notes by William Sinclair, November 28, p. 1002, and Gilbert Mackereth, December 12, p. 1058.

Dr. Sanderson, Bishop of Lincoln (W. Odom), p. 926.

Place of birth.

November 21—

Wycherley and the Countess of Drogheda (W. G. Hargest), p. 960.

Further note by Eleanore Boswell, November 28, pp. 1001-2.

All's Well That Ends Well (Henry Cuninghame), p. 978.

Suggested emendations of iv. ii. 38 and iii. ii. 111.

November 28—

The Text of Sheridan (F. W. Bateson), p. 998.

Successive versions of *The School for Scandal* and *The Rivals*. Continued December 5, p. 1029. Note by Newport B. White, December 5, p. 1032 ; replies by R. Crompton Rhodes, December 19, pp. 1081-2, and December 26, p. 1097 ; note by Richard L. Purdy, January 2, p. 12 ; rejoinders by F. W. Bateson, January 9, p. 28 ; by R. Crompton Rhodes, January 16, p. 44 ; by F. W. Bateson, January 23, p. 60.

"The Matter of Britain" (A. E. Parsons), p. 1002.

Evidence that Geoffrey of Monmouth's work was "State-conceived."

December 5—

"Mad as a Hatter" (Austen Chamberlain), p. 1032.

Origin of phrase.

Donne and Lucretius (H. J. C. Grierson), p. 1032.

Note on *Goodfriday, 1613, Riding Westward*, l. 22.

The Rural Lass and Tam Glen (Bernard L. Jefferson), p. 1032.

English analogue of Burns' poem.

December 12—

Lady Sedley's Receipt Book (Eleanore Boswell), p. 1058.

Question of identity. Note by V. de S. Pinto, December 19, p. 1082.

A Rossetti Ballad (Thomas J. Wise), p. 1058.

MS. and editions of *Jan van Huns*.

Sir Walter Raleigh and *The Phoenix Nest* (Hyder E. Rollins), p. 1058.

December 19—

Dryden and Descartes (H. O. White), p. 1081.

Note on *The State of Innocence and Fall of Man*, II. i. Note by Louis I. Bredvold, January 2, p. 12.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, December 26—

More about the *Boke of Balettes* (Robert A. Law), p. 1097.

Possibility that it is the first edition of *The Courte of Venus*.

The Nonesuch *Vathek* (John Hodgkin), p. 1097.

Bibliographical note on editions of 1815 and 1816. Replies by Guy Chapman, January 2, p. 12; by H. B. Grimsditch, January 9, p. 28; by Guy Chapman, January 16, p. 44; by J. Hodgkin, January 23, p. 60.

The Tragedy of Iephte (Bernard M. Wagner), p. 1097.

MS. in the Bodleian. Note by F. S. Boas, January 30, p. 78.

R. L. S. and Mrs. Macmorland (G. S. Pringle), p. 1097.

Note by W. G. Lockett, January 30, p. 78.

January 2, 1930—

Henry Kingsley, pp. 1-2.

Notes by Paget Toynbee and G. C. Moore Smith, January 9, p. 28; by E. M. Bullock and H. Price, January 16, p. 44.

Edgeworth's *Castle Rackrent* (William Talbot), p. 12.

Note on early editions.

January 16—

Oxford Restoration Prologues (W. J. Lawrence), p. 43.

"Yes, by St. Patrick" (E. H. Synge), p. 44.

Hamlet's use of the oath.

January 30—

Wordsworth's "Lucy" (John Bailey), p. 78.

English Novels in France (Rowland Grey), p. 78.

French appreciation of Jane Austen.

The Seven Ages of Man (Herman Cohen), p. 78.

Possible sources.

Keats and C. A. Brown (E. Blunden), p. 78.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS BULLETIN: STUDIES IN ENGLISH, Number 8,
July 8, 1928—

Recent Works in the Field of English Linguistics (1921-1927) (Morgan Callaway, Jr.), pp. 5-41.

The First British Colonization of Brittany (Clark H. Slover), pp. 42-49.
Evidence of colonization in the fourth century.

The Syntax of the Superlative in Old Norse (Jess H. Jackson),
pp. 50-64.

Elizabeth as Euphuist before *Euphuus* (Theodore Stenberg), pp. 65-78.

The Version of the Bible used by Peele in the Composition of *David and Bethsabe* (Arthur M. Sampley), pp. 79-87.

Milton's Conception of Samson (Evert M. Clark), pp. 88-99.

More about Dryden as an Adapter of Shakespeare (D. T. Starnes),
pp. 100-07.

Some Nineteenth Century Critics of Realism (Houghton W. Taylor),
pp. 110-28.

by Guy
p. 28;
p. 60.

. 28; by

umber 8,

Morgan

. 42-49.

ackson),

. 65-78.

f David

tarnes),

Taylor),